00037967

956·1
Sin
~~Der~~/Def
37967

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 23 January, 2019

WWC24

00037967

956.1
Bur/Def
37967

"Let 'British interests' live, let tortured Christians die,
But spare, oh spare, our Turks' integrity."

Lord John Manners' poem, adapted to the Eastern Q

"Perchè Constantinopoli e del mondo
La miglior parte occupa il Turco immondo
. . . . . .
Caccial d'Europa."

Ariosto, "Orl

37967 al. (1877)

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.—STRIKE, BUT HEAR.

A DEFENCE OF RUSSIA

AND THE

B 936

CHRISTIANS OF TURKEY;

CLUDING A SKETCH OF THE EASTERN QUESTION, FROM
86 TO SEPTEMBER, 1877, WITH ITS BEST SOLUTION,
THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE GREEK EMPIRE,"
AND STRICTURES ON THEIR OPPONENTS;

ORIGINAL CARTOON OF THE TURKISH ATROCITIES,
P OF TURKEY, AND SEVERAL CARICATURES.

BY

Sinclair, Bart., M.P.

his babbler say?"

ring up the Turkish power in Europe. It
Greek Empire. There is no doubt it would
of Adrianople had not been signed, if the
he Turkish Empire had been dissolved."—

1833 as allies the Turks."—

was ubt, prescribed
Dis Sir Hamilton

than the howl-
m, and paltry

sh Proverb

Forsyth.

air's) courage,

LLY.

published at
usly in any

CONTENTS.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RUSSIA . . . .

THE WILL OF PETER THE GREAT PROVED TO BE FORGERY . . . . . .

SKETCH OF PAST PHASES OF THE EASTERN QUESTION

HISTORY OF THE PRESENT PHASE OF THE EAST QUESTION . . . . . .

A FORECAST OF THE PROBABLE RESULTS OF THE PR RUSSO-TURKISH WAR . . . .

MAHOMETANISM UNMASKED . . . .

THE SULTAN NOT THE HEAD OF THE MA RELIGION . . . , . . .

"THE UNSPEAKABLE TURK" . .

POLAND FROM A COMMON SENSE POINT OF

IRELAND THE ENGLISH POLAND .

A BENEVOLENT DESPOTISM BETTER THAN PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT .

REFUTATION OF COLONEL MANSFIELD

THE INDIAN NIGHTMARE . .

"WE MUST RECONSTRUCT THE GREEK

CONCLUDING CHAPTER . . .

ERRATA.

PAGE.	LINE.	
9	33	*For* "In my letters to the *Scotsman*" *read* "In my chapter on the present phase of the Eastern Question."
2	24	*For* "odius" *read* "odious."
		Omit "task."
		Omit "German."
		After "consequence of" *insert* "the jealousy of."
		After "Lord Grey" *insert* "in 1877."
		Omit "(Shiites)."
		"he" *read* "Lord Derby."
		"the Turk" insert "a Turk."
		"*Times*" *read* "correspondent."
		"The exclusion" *read* "O'Neill Daunt says."
		"laws" *insert* "phraseology."
		"I have to remark" *read* "What"
		should read: "Qui cum Jesu itis non itis cum Jesuitis."
		" *insert* "English."
		rived" *insert* "of it."
		read "almost."
		I have had a dotted line traced thereon, in accordance Bianconi's views."

TURKISH RECREATIONS;

Being their idea of "*Integrity*," and "*Independence*;" or, "Liberty! Equality!! and Fraternity!!!"

INDEX TO THE ABOVE CARTOON.

"The Unspeakable Turk."—*Carlyle.*
Batak.
Blind Father and Daughter Shot Through.
Krustitza Church.
Pastor, a Priest at Batak.
E.—Transfixed, Spitted, and Burnt.
F.—Two Priests Hung in Chains and Crucified.
G.—A Priest at Philipopolis.
H.—Raika.
I.—At Batak.

NOTE ON THE PANSLAVISTS OF RUSSIA.

In my chapter on "The Reconstruction of the Greek Empire," I have very strongly expressed my opposition to Panslavism, and have given the reasons on which it is grounded; but, on the other hand, I think it is only right that I should record the very great esteem and regard which I entertain for the President of the Panslavist Committee (M. Aksakoff), Dr. Pontsykóvitch, and others who belong to it; and I firmly believe that the Russian Panslavists, as a body, are infinitely superior, both in intelligence, patriotism, energy, influence, and character, to the great bulk of their countrymen who hold opposite opinions or none at all.

It is generally believed that the just and necessary war in which Russia is now engaged in order to free the Christians of Turkey from the intolerable yoke of the Sultan might never have been waged but for the impulse which was given to the national spirit by the patriotic ardour of the Panslavists; but now that Russia is engaged in this great struggle, the whole nation feels as one man on the subject, from the Emperor to the humblest peasant, and they are unanimously determined to complete the heroic task which they have undertaken, and which has already involved sacrifices of life and treasure which no possible gains in territory or otherwise can ever repay.

As far as I can judge, one Panslavist is at least equal to ten average Russians, especially the somniferous Rip Van Winkle Conservative party, who are opposed to all free development of Russian institutions. When Mr. Gladstone's powerful pamphlet appeared last year, the ruling party in Russia had not the intelligence to see that the publication of that work in the Russian and other European languages would afford more powerful support to the cause of the Christians in Turkey and their Russian liberators than a whole army of soldiers, as opinion, not material force only, rules the world; and it was reserved, as I am informed, for an English speculator from London to bring out the work in Russian, which was financially and politically a great success. In the case of the present work, a Panslavist Russian editor volunteered to translate it; and whilst from 250 to 1,000 copies is the average number of an edition, he is to print no less than 7,400 in his first issue, which is both an extraordinary and unlooked-for practical compliment, which I appreciate more than any verbal and often insincere praise.

In this great cause of the Christians of Turkey I shall work preferentially with the Panslavist party, as their volunteers are worth any number of pressed men. Panslavism cannot, by any possibility, become a practical question for many years; and if, when this Eastern Question is settled, it should become a burning question during my life, and I should feel compelled to oppose it, it would be with infinite reluctance that I should find myself range against such brave, energetic, able, and worthy opponents, and I should be disposed to exclaim with the French at Fontenoy, "Gentlemen of the Panslavist party, fire first!"

PREFACE.

HAVING visited Turkey, Asia Minor, Greece, Syria, and Egypt; having studied the Eastern Question with special interest for many years; and having observed with astonishment and regret the profound ignorance and utterly erroneous views which prevail in England, even among our politicians and public writers, on this absorbing topic—a darkness which may be felt, like a November fog in London—I have devoted the whole of my available leisure for the last six months to its further consideration, more especially in connection with the eventful history of Turkey during the last two years, and I now lay before the public the results of my investigations and reflections.

When it is considered that the Parliamentary Blue Books on the Turkish and collateral questions embrace several thousand closely printed folio pages; that the debates in Parliament have occupied a considerable number of days; that pamphlets by the score have had to be examined; and that I have found it necessary to re-peruse many historical works, as also the whole of the debates on the Eastern and other relative questions for nearly a hundred years; and not only to peruse carefully the more influential organs of the daily and weekly press of England, but frequently the journals of other countries; some idea may be formed by the reader of the arduous nature of the task I have undertaken, which was far more laborious

than I had anticipated; and I own I am surprised to find that the collection of the materials for this work and the time occupied in writing it have occupied no less than six months, working sometimes six, eight, or even ten hours a day.

The deep interest I have always felt in the Eastern Question originally arose from my visit to Turkey, and the painful impression produced on my mind by the misery and oppression of the wretched Christians there, which caused an American to observe that "hell itself could not be conducted on such principles" as those which actuated the Ottoman Government; and this interest was deepened and confirmed by the loss I sustained in the Crimea of my oldest and dearest friend, in what I have always considered an unjust, unnecessary, and aggressive war as regards Russia, and a fearful national crime as respects the Christians of Turkey, whom we deprived of the efficient and constant protection of Russia without providing any adequate substitute, and left to the "tender mercies of the wicked" (Turk), which David tells us "are cruel."

I am well aware of the very homœopathic influence which can possibly be exercised by anything that I can write, with however much earnestness and labour, and that even the best cause and the strongest arguments and facts made use of by my unknown and unskilful hands would be less attractive to the general public than the worst cause and the most fallacious arguments brought forward by a known and practised writer; still I cannot resist the impulse which impels me to contribute my obscure mite to what in my soul and conscience I believe to be a just and sacred cause, namely, that of the Christians of Turkey and their disinterested and chivalrous Russian liberators.

Let the reader, if he will, put aside and skip over as absolute

worthless every line that I myself have written ;* still he will find in the numerous quotations which I have made from the works of the ablest writers and statesmen during the last hundred years on the Eastern and kindred questions, such a body of facts and arguments on this subject as he could hardly obtain in any other single work, and perhaps even those who are irreconcilably opposed to my views may thank me for guiding them through the mazes of the labyrinth which constitutes the Eastern Question. Few, probably, would have the patience to explore all the old and musty documents which I have had to examine, and without the resources of the libraries of the House of Commons and of the Travellers' Club, I should have been unable to collect a large portion of my materials. The *Times* newspaper of half a century ago, for instance, is out of print, and can hardly be purchased for money, yet it is impossible to treat the Eastern Question satisfactorily without turning from time to time to this able and instructive journal.

This work has been composed amidst the countless distractions of Parliamentary duties, private business, and social-pleasures; and, from the superabundance of materials which were continually accumulating, and which had to be interpolated, the unity of the original design has been lost, and the style of the work, I fear, hopelessly destroyed, as I have not had time to digest properly the facts and arguments so as to fit them in always at the places where they ought to be, to vary my synonyms, and to introduce and dismiss them with a sufficient number of preliminary observations, which, besides, would have required several volumes.

I felt alarmed at the idea that England might be involved in another Crimean war, when I would have desired another Navarino ;

* However, as the Russian translator is printing 7,400 copies at his own risk, for the first edition, it is probably tolerably readable.

and I have, therefore, been anxious that my little work should appear before any such decided success was obtained by the Russians as would strengthen the Russophobists in urging the nation into a war with Russia, our best and oldest ally, for supposed British interests; and in this match against time I find myself beaten, and obliged to publish my work in its crude, unfinished state. It may, however, at least serve as a quarry where abler writers and more influential politicians may find abundance of material ready to their hands for defending the cause of the oppressed Christians or an armoury where anti-Turkish weapons may be found; and if it answers even these humble purposes I shall be abundantly satisfied.

The characteristics of nearly all Parliamentary speeches and o most writings are that they are stilted in style and marred by e treme verbosity. One has to wait a considerable time to catch rare intervals a fact or an argument, like an oasis in the dese of Sahara. On the other hand, my book falls into the opposi error of being crowded, like a marriage cake, with too many del cacies, and a very little will soon cloy the literary palate; or is like Liebig's essence of meat, in which the nutriment of a who ox is condensed into a small jar, the result being that it is absolute uneatable unless diluted.

As I am an enthusiastic, heart-and-soul, and out-and-out sup porter of the cause of the Christians of Turkey, of their Russia deliverers, and of the Greek Empire, I may as well state that I a perfectly disinterested on this burning question. I have never hel a single Turkish, Russian, or Greek bond, and I have no propert friends, or relatives in any of the three countries. In spite of th proverb, "You must not look a gift horse in the mouth," I have n doubt that my elaborate work will be severely criticised, but I an

not at all thin-skinned, and all I desire is, that my opponents will in fairness come forward with their real names and not attack me anonymously, that I may have a clear stage and no favour, and that they will not imitate the *Pall Mall Gazette*,* which stigmatised me in a leading article of more than a page as "foolish, ignorant, presumptuous, and arrogant," and then refused to insert a few much too polite sentences to justify myself.

Job, the most patient man that ever lived, wished that his enemy had written a book, and I hope the publication of this work will afford the enemies of the Christian and Russian cause all the satisfaction which the patriarch anticipated for himself under such circumstances.

I will now append a few words to this Preface to explain what this book contains. In the first portion will be found an historical retrospect of the Eastern Question for nearly two hundred years, the substance of a speech of an hour's length which I delivered in the debate on the Eastern Question, and an abridged and critical sketch of the Crimean war. I offered the whole of the materials then in my possession to Mr. Gladstone—of whom it may be said that "(political) science is his forte and omniscience is his foible"—before the debate, hoping that he would make use of them with his usual skill, and that I should thus be able to spare the House the fatigue of listening to me, and myself the uncongenial task of speaking to an unsympathetic and supercilious audience, who heard me as if they were asking each other, in the words of my motto, "What will this babbler say?"—though I doubt if a single man in either House of Parliament knew even the simple and recent fact that the Russians occupied Constantinople in 1833; but his time was

* A heading for a slashing article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* against me would be "*Nihil quod tetigit non vitiavit.*"

so absorbed in the highly popular, interesting, and burning questions of English pottery and the remains of Troy, to say nothing of an infinite number of other topics of equally pressing importance, that he not only would not accept the park of anti-Turkish artillery which I had so laboriously collected, but never read a single syllable of a couple of columns of printed matter, which contained a condensation of the main facts and arguments with almost telegraphic brevity. Then comes a complete exhaustive, and, perhaps, exhausting critical analysis of the whole of the existing phase of the Eastern Question, from January 1st, 1875, when the rising in the Herzegovina began, till the present date, including full extracts from the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, the proceedings of the Conference, the Protocol of London, the Russian and English declarations, and numerous other documents.

There is then a chapter called Mahometanism Unmasked, afterwards another to prove that the Sultan is not the Head of the Mahometan Religion; then a chapter on the Unspeakable Turk; the truth about Russia, including a detailed proof that the supposed Will of Peter the Great was a forgery; a common-sense view of the Polish Question; a chapter on Benevolent Despotism better than Constitutionalism when tyrannical; on "Ireland the English Poland," showing that our conduct to that country has been worse than anything which has been ever proved against Russia; and other chapters. Though I am most friendly to Russia, and to the Slavonians generally, I am not a partisan of Pan-Slavism, and by supporting the reconstruction of the Greek Empire, I unavoidably, but unwillingly, give what I trust will only be an evanescent dissatisfaction to a section of the Slavonic race, and especially of the Russian nationality.

I have added to my work a most important and interesting letter

from Comte Seebach, formerly Saxon Minister in Paris, to Lord Beaconsfield, accusing him of now pursuing a policy on the Eastern Question which is inconsistent with his former professions and convictions, and which is vacillating, weak, and insincere; of having been in communication with the enemy during the Crimean War on British policy, and of having promised the Czar that if he became Minister, as he then expected, he would reverse the policy which England was then pursuing.

Those of my readers who wish to master the salient points of the Eastern Question, without perusing too many dry details, will obtain a good general notion of the matter by reading the chapter headed, "Sketch of Past Phases of the Eastern Qustion," extending om page 36 to 57; and any of them who may suffer from sleepsness will find the longer chapter, headed, "History of the esent Phase of the Eastern Question," an almost infallible rcotic. Those who seek amusement will find some satire and fun the chapters in the Appendix on Baron Henry de Worms' book, "The Jew the Eternal Foe of the Christian," and on the Debate the House of Commons on the Eastern Question; and, most of in the capital sketch of Eastern Manners, from Thackeray; the erview between the Englishman and the Turkish Pasha, by nglake, now out of print; and the witty, satirical verses on "The ckinghamshire Buffoon."

n concluding the Preface to this work *de omnibus rebus et quidam aliis*, I would recommend my readers to remember Dean t's tenth beatitude, "Blessed are they who expect nothing, for shall never be disappointed."

PREFACE TO SIXTH THOUSAND.

A WORD TO MY CRITICS.

HAVING received a large number of criticisms from various London, provincial, and continental newspapers, both on my "Defence of Russia," and on my speeches in Caithness, I avail myself of an unexpected delay which has occurred in the publication of the complete bound and illustrated edition of my work to make a few remarks in reply.

Being, like Paul Jones, "grateful for praise, spontaneous and unbought," I cordially thank some of those who have done me the honour of noticing my book, for the kindly, genial, and sometimes only too flattering way in which they have criticised it; whilst adverse critics have sometimes shown a disposition to give me fair play; and even those who are most hostile, by the prominence they have given to my publication in their columns and their unsparing antagonism, may perhaps do my work more good in the eyes of an impartial public than a portion of those who are friendly to my production, but some of these wiseacres persist in calling my work of upwards of 500 pages a pamphlet, because, like all French works, the cheap edition is issued in paper covers.

I have been immensely diverted by some of these adverse criticisms; and, though I prefer seeing others satirized, and am somewhat given to irony myself, I enjoy it, even at my own expense, when cleverly done with, as it were, a sharp razor, and not a blunt and rusty knife. It is certainly a little singular that some of those who consider my book and my speeches utterly worthless and unreadable, should, nevertheless, have devoted leading articles and columns of type to the endeavour to demolish me; and I have especially to notice the *Standard*, which used to be known as Mrs. Gamp, and which has honoured me with a column of censure in large type, for which I am infinitely obliged, whilst I should

have been quite inconsolable if it had praised me. In the examinations at the primary schools, scholars are classified according to standards, and I should imagine that the lowest possible standard must be the *Standard* newspaper, at any rate it is at the tail of the daily Press, and even Conservatives rarely read it, though, in compassion, and to help the party, they may reluctantly take it in.

The *Standard* says: "A man so innocent of a joke was, perhaps, never produced north of the boundary line between England and Scotland." Now, I think few books on political subjects contain so many good stories and jokes, some of which have always enjoyed a great reputation, whilst others have been handed down to me by my father, who was one of the wittiest men I ever knew. It so happens that I am known among my friends as one who is especially fond of jokes, and I am willing to wager ten to one that I will beat the Editor of the *Standard* and all his staff in telling stories in English and French, and in various dialects, giving him the benefit of a Conservative and Turcophile jury to decide who is the winner. By the way, perhaps, the *Standard* will take the opportunity of showing the point of the joke which it placards all over London, namely, that it is the largest newspaper in the world, whilst the *Times* is evidently not only as superior in quality and influence "as a silk purse to a sow's ear," but much more considerable in size. But I suppose this is a pious fraud to bolster up the waning fortunes of Mrs. Gamp.

The *Standard* says my book contains "sportive essays of his own, of which it is only fair to say that they are entertaining beyond any idea of amusement which could be conceived by their author himself." As authors generally are sufficiently partial to their own works, this sentence is praise of the highest order. He adds that "Here may be found *the cream* of all that the pamphleteers and the writers on the Eastern Question have been saying on the Eastern Question," and these words alone show the utility of my work, and acquit me of the fatal error of quoting any of the *skim milk* of the *Standard*.

As an illustration of the proverb that "none are so blind as those who won't see," I may mention that one of my critics, with a letter before him from the Liberal Committee of Caithness, unanimously

expressing their satisfaction that I had agreed to remain till the Dissolution, says that "his constituents are heartily sick of him."

Some newspapers say that the work is "unreadable"—"a crude heap of irrelevant and undigested material;" others that "it gives the right information at the right moment," that "some chapters are especially valuable and highly instructive," that "the public could not do better than make a careful perusal of the work," that "everybody will find in it something suitable to his literary palate," that "it is a very well written work from a facile pen," that "there is much lively writing in it," that "the author is a solemn and conceited bore" (*Glasgow Herald*), that "the felling of trees would be a light task compared with the perusal of Sir T. Sinclair's rejected letters" (*Pall Mall Gazette*), and of another work of mine, "it was a capital lecture, full of cleverness and of bold yet kindly truth-telling" (*Scotsman*), whilst the *Saturday Reviler*, after stating that Scotch Liberals "must often despise the elected" M.P.'s, adds, that only eight of us have ever been heard of out of Scotland, in the face of the fact that some of my writings on the Eastern Question have been reproduced in the Russian, French, German, and Greek languages.

Some Turcophile newspapers complain of the large number of quotations which I have given from eminent statesmen and writers in favour of Russia and against Turkey, and no doubt some chapters—and especially the first—are overloaded with facts statistics, and quotations, but all of these have been selected and carefully pruned down to the narrowest compass; and I would consider it dishonest to plagiarize, unacknowledged, the ideas and words of other authors, as was proved against D'Israeli; whilst the same journals praise Baron de Worms' book on the Turkish side, though more than half of his book consists of entire Blue Books, unabridged and undigested; but according to the proverb, "One man may steal a horse, the other must not look over the fence."

One critic, in spite of the proverb that you should not look a gift horse in the mouth, takes me to task for "worrying newspaper editors" by sending them my book; adding "that it is almost an insult to expect an editor—much more to ask *it*—to wade through such a confused, unconnected, and disorganised

mass of matter." The writer of this sentence should have remembered that people in glass houses should not throw stones, for his criticism is much more heterogeneous than my book, his grammar leaves much to be desired; and I did not ask him to criticise my book, but to send me any criticism *if he chose* to review it. I was not aware that an editor was of the neuter gender till this one informed me so, and if he is neuter he certainly is not neutral. More than one of these "men in the *brazen* mask" hit at me below the belt, but their adroitness and courage is not equal to their malignity.

Another editor complains of me for inflicting so intolerable a work on the patience of the reading public, but I have yet to learn that there is any Act of Parliament by which even a single individual can be compelled to buy it; and though some chapters may be overloaded with quotations, and inartistically composed, there are others in each volume open to no such objection, and these alone are well worth the single shilling which is the price of each volume, and a great deal cheaper than his stupid journal at one penny.

Nothing is more common than for an author to publish a volume of essays on any subject or variety of subjects, and magazines and reviews contain the most heterogeneous topics. Why, then, should I be condemned for taking up the Eastern Question in all its ramifications? And if I have, according to another editor, produced a "hodge-podge," I can only say there is no dish more palatable.

There is hardly a sentence in my book which is not directly or indirectly connected with the Eastern Question, only some reviewers are so dense, so prejudiced, or so careless that they cannot see what is obvious to any impartial and acute reader.

Whatever faults there may be in the style and arrangement of my work, it is a curious fact that though I urged my Russian translator to prune its excrescences, transpose any passages that were wrongly placed, vary any synonyms, omit those facts which were not likely to interest foreigners, and even whole chapters if he thought proper, without my being in the least offended or dissatisfied, he has translated and printed my work

verbatim, excepting that he has omitted the chapter on the reconstruction of the Greek Empire, which is contrary to the ideas of the Slav Committee, of which he is a member. If my work is so utterly devoid of merit, as some critics pretend, it is not likely that the Russians would be such idiots as to print a first edition of 7,400 copies, an honour which they did not even confer on Mr. Gladstone, whose pamphlet was translated into Russian, and published by an English speculator. Many pamphlets have been published by the Eastern Association, and by individuals in favour of Russia and the Christians, but not one has been translated into Russian, nor have the Turks thought it worth while to translate and publish either Baron de Worms' book or any of the other Turcomaniac works which Turcophile critics so greatly prefer to mine.

To collect all the books, pamphlets, newspapers, reviews, &c., from which I have quoted would cost an enormous sum, and those who find fault with my quotations do so because their views are so thoroughly confuted by my authorities that they have not a leg to stand upon. They surely cannot pretend that they have previously read all, or even a large proportion, of the quotations I have made, and that they retain vividly in their memories any considerable proportion of those with which they were antecedently acquainted.

Because this is the first book I ever published in the English language, my previous book on the Franco-German War having been published in German, and that I am unknown as an author, some of these unjust and unscrupulous critics think they can safely run down my work; but, if I obtain a clear stage and no favour, I am ready to meet (and refute) any number of them, and the more the merrier. If the name of any well-known author had been on my title-page, they would have praised the book; and, if my name had been on one of Mr. Gladstone's works, they would have condemned it; just as the critics of a former generation were taken in by Ireland's forgeries on Shakespeare, and lauded them as immortal works, but, when it was discovered that they were Ireland's own composition, they said that they were the greatest rubbish that anyone had ever written.

Some of my critics fall foul of me for some grammatical and other errors which are the fault of the printer, and which I have corrected in the Errata; and this is, I suppose, their notion of fair play.

The *Nord Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* says of one of my chapters: "Sir T. Sinclair has a claim to the consideration of the Germans, who remember with pleasure their debt of gratitude to him. So far no one could treat the subject with more warmth and eloquence."

The *Nord* says of another portion of my work that it made a great sensation in Russia, and the Russian translator of my book is publishing a first edition of 7,400 copies, the usual number being from 250 to 500, whilst the whole trade of London only subscribed for three copies!

Mr. Holyoake said of another publication of mine:—"There is an air of clever and amusing candour about it, there is a calculating recklessness in the style, which is quite refreshing. The speaker appears to dash off his ideas, but, when the phrases have entertained the reader, there is found to be good sound sense in them."

The *World* says:—"Sir Tollemache Sinclair is the clever and eccentric son of a more clever and eccentric father. He has much curious knowledge of out-of-the-way subjects, which has perhaps not received due recognition. He has an awkward way of occasionally bringing to light inconvenient passages in the lives of eminent individuals, and recently, as we noticed at the time in these columns, reminded the world of Mr. D'Israeli's overtures twenty years ago to Count Seebach—an allegation which may be regarded as historically established, and which was not in the remotest degree disposed of by the Prime Minister's jaunty letter to Sir S. Northcote. . . Valuable as is the service he might perform for the Liberal party, he remains a political *homme incompris*."

I have also received autograph letters of thanks from Prince Bismarck and Count Moltke for my writings in favour of Germany, and portions of this work have been reprinted in Greek and other languages.

I further subjoin an able letter which I have received from M.

Aksakoff, President of the Slav Committee of Moscow, which shows his opinion of my work even in its incomplete state, and which also shows that the general supposition in Western Europe that the design of the Slav party in Russia is to annex all the Slavonic race to the Russian Empire, is entirely unfounded, and I may here further add a fact which appears in the Turcophile *Globe* of November 1, and which is most creditable to the Russians :— "During the last ten years the formation of scholarships in preference to the erection of monuments, has been carried on with so much vigour, that during that period the number of purses established may be reckoned by thousands. . . Sometimes as many as a hundred have been authorised in one morning."

The *Daily Review* of Edinburgh, the organ of the Free Church, in a notice of my book, speaks of my "combined folly and vulgarity. That it should be possible for such a speaker and writer as the Member for Caithness to find a seat, though it has long been hereditary in his family, is *a reflection alike on the House of Commons* and the people of Caithness." This thick-skulled and venomous critic shows his ignorance by stating that the seat has been hereditary in my family, as Mr. Traill held it for nearly thirty years between my father and myself, and my great-grandfather never was in Parliament. The *Daily Review*, in a leading article, abused me for saying that the leaders of the Liberal party were supercilious and snubbed their followers, and defied me to give further and more satisfactory proofs ; but it is a fact that Mr. Smith, the Conservative First Lord of the Admiralty, was blackballed as a candidate for the Reform Club, because, forsooth, he was a tradesman, and that Sir John Holker, now Attorney-General, was also excluded from the Reform, besides Sir H. Peek and many others, whose adherence materially strengthens the Conservative and weakens the Liberal party. I complained of being snubbed by Lord Hartington, not because I had not received more than my fair share of hospitality from him, as I drew a soup ticket for dinner at Devonshire House in the usual lottery last season, and, though these entertainments are usually intolerably dull, and I sat between an Obstructive and a Destructive, with a Constructive on the opposite side, still the dinner was excellent ; but the Hartington

sauce is, to me, most unpalatable, though other M.P.'s may not object to it, or even enjoy it. My critic does not explain how it can be a reflection on the House of Commons that I have been able not "to find a seat," as he says, but that I was willing to accept a seat, which was conferred on me unsolicited by the people of Caithness.

The *Birmingham Advertiser* politely speaks of my essays as "sodden, unenlivened by a spark of wit or humour. It is merely coarse and disjointed irony, and if it were not the workmanship of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, we should say it was that *of an idiot.*" On the other hand, the *Wycombe Telegraph* says, "We refer careful readers to this work with the greatest pleasure; it is almost a complete Encyclopœdia on this subject. There can be no question of this, that Sir T. Sinclair writes well, and that very little of the book is taken up with redundant expressions or tautology;" and the *Salford Weekly Chronicle*, though hostile, adds, "Why cannot Sir Tollemache devote his rare and undoubted abilities to the promotion of some work by which he would leave as lasting a name, and as wholesome an influence as those who have gone before him?"

I come now to the *Athenæum*, which treats me to a couple of pages of adverse but dull criticism, which would be dear at a farthing a line. It begins by calling me an elderly Highland gentleman, but I want many years of being elderly, and my residence is beyond the Highlands. He is again mistaken in saying that I stated I did not get a hearing in the House of Commons, for I spoke without any interruption to a supercilious House for an hour on the Eastern Question. My critic must have been at a great loss for points of attack as he has selected so trifling a subject as my observations on the *diner à la Russe*, but the real fact is, that these unknown, anonymous, and insignificant penny-a-liners usually, instead of reading the book they pretend to criticise, merely cast their eye over the index, or table of contents, and select any topic which they think will suit them; and they remind me of an amusing satire on one of their fraternity, who is represented as saying, "I have now given the public all that it is necessary for them to know, and more than they can

appreciate of my decisions on the literature of the week. The above works are all that I have had leisure to look at; still, the mere fact of my not having seen them would not prevent me from criticising all the rest if it was expedient or necessary. On the whole, I consider the works of this week decidedly in advance of those of the last, as that was of its predecessor, which I attribute to my weekly critiques; and I doubt not that after diligent study of this week's critiques considerable progress will be manifested in future."

The *Athenæum* then states, "Toleration, *except to dissenters*, says Sir Tollemache, is a tradition of Russian policy (p. 10); but it was Mr. Wallace, as I state, that said this, and I understand him to mean that whilst the Russians are tolerant to Roman Catholics, United Greeks, Jews, Mussulmans, &c., who are born in these faiths, they are, like the Mussulmans, not tolerant to those who abjure the orthodox religion, when they are born members of that creed.

My critic says that "whole congregations and villages are commanded by the head of the Church to abjure the rites they have been brought up to reverence," but I have proved the contrary in my chapter refuting Colonel Mansfield.

My reviewer, too, while attacking the Czars for not giving a constitution to Russia, conveniently ignores the fact to which I had given prominence, that Finland has always had a most liberal constitution, and that Russia respected the Polish constitution till their unwise and unjustifiable rebellion, which rebellion was the main cause which prevented the Emperor from fulfilling his intention of giving a constitution to the whole empire. Even one of Mr. Freeman's lectures is pronounced by this superior being, whose name is probably as obscure as that of Mr. Freeman's is eminent, to be crude, whilst his own dicta are crude without the "c."

With reference to my attack on oppressive parliaments, this new Longinus says: "It does so happen that all those cases occurred before the Parliaments of the three kingdoms was incorporated into one," from which it follows that, in the opinion of this critic, the greater respect for law and love of justice which characterised the hundred and odd Irish Members who joined the

British Parliament, put an end to the lawlessness and oppression of the large majority of English and Scotch members! He also says "that the atrocities committed in Ireland by the English took place when there was neither national representation there, nor imperial representation here;" but if the British Parliament took advantage of the absence of Irish representatives before the Union to oppress the Irish nation, and did not venture to do so afterwards, when the Union took place and they had to face the representatives of Ireland, their conduct was cowardly and wicked in the extreme.

The reviewer, who, probably, himself often means the contrary of what he says, and sometimes does not appear to know his own meaning or his own mind, pretends, in the face of the quotation which I have given from the Duke of Wellington's despatches, namely, "we must reconstruct the Greek Empire," that he had no such wish, and I never said he wished "to set up an Hellenic puppet;" in fact, on two successive occasions, the Greeks have chosen foreigners, and not Greeks, as kings. Besides, so far from the Greeks being puppets of the Russians, their views are irreconcileably opposed, for the Greeks justly consider they have a right to the whole of Turkey as far as the Balkans, and the Russians consider that the greater part of this territory belongs to the Slavonian race. My critic accuses me of taking "copious draughts of *Punch*"; but about four pages out of upwards of five hundred cannot fairly be termed a "copious draught;" and the conclusion is irresistible, from this and other exaggerations, that my critic was under the influence of copious draughts of another kind of punch, which is usually made from rum, though his attempts to be *rum*, are complete failures. Again, Lord Robert Montagu's thick octavo volume is not a pamphlet, as my critic says; but space would fail me to expose his numerous errors and the vindictive animus which he shows against me.

If my book reaches a second edition I will unearth and name some of these critical foxes, and drag these (Grub Street) owls into an uncongenial daylight, instead of the misty twilight in which they like to hide themselves and spue their venom over their opponents. Why do they not, like the manly and able

writers in the *Contemporary* and *Fortnightly Reviews*, in the *Nineteenth Century*, the *North American Review*, the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and the whole of the French newspapers, attach their names to their articles, instead of stabbing their victims in the dark with their vile and poisoned arrows? With some of them I have the misfortune to be personally acquainted, and one of them told me that he was obliged to cut up and abuse my book, though he thought it extremely clever, amusing, and instructive. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, with an utter and un-English regard for fair play, abused my article on the "Indian Nightmare" in a leader filling the whole front page of the paper, and part of the next, disengenuously concealing my name, which I had published, and said that I was "arrogant, foolish, ignorant," &c.; but when I wrote a very short note, justifying myself, and pointing out a signal and ridiculous statistical mistake they had made, they refused to insert it, their principle being *la mort sans phrase*; and I ask the public to say whether this is not most dishonest conduct on the part of Mr. Greenwood, the editor of the *Pall Mall*.

One of the most brilliant and successful writers on the Eastern Question, whose works have passed through many editions wrote to me as follows:—"As you know, I am diametrically opposed to your opinions upon the Eastern War Question, but my partizanship does not prevent me from admiring the fiery Scot's combative spirit, the undaunted courage, and the almost romantic forgetfulness of self and self interest with which you tear into the fight."

In the meantime, hostile critics, *au revoir*, and may you soon have another Byron to demolish you in a new "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers."

LETTER FROM M. AKSAKOFF, PRESIDENT OF THE SLAV COMMITTEE OF MOSCOW, TO SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

SIR,—If I have not written to you sooner it is not that I have delayed voluntarily to reply to you, but because, after having received the letter with which you have honoured me, I awaited the arrival of the proof-sheets of your book which is now in the press. I possess them now, and I hasten to thank you warmly

for the agreeable hours of moral satisfaction that you have caused me to experience. Without speaking of the thrilling interest which the numerous quotations on the Eastern Question collected in your book present, one feels oneself edified by that spirit of justice, by that laborious love of truth, by that courage of one's own opinion, by that noble and frank indignation against iniquity which your work displays, and which serve powerfully to reconcile we Russians with the English nation.

It is notorious, sir, that at this moment Russian society is more than outraged by the political conduct of your Government, by its proceedings towards us, and by all the atrocious calumnies with which the greater part of the English newspapers—organs of the Beaconsfield Ministry—inundate us. It is, therefore, a service rendered not only to the cause of the Eastern Christians, but to your own country, to show to the world in general, and to Russia in particular, that the existing Cabinet cannot be considered as the true representative of the mind, of the thought, and of the sentiments of the English people. In protesting loudly, as you do, sir, in the name of the English nation, against the policy pursued by your Government, you save the honour and the reputation of your country, and you give us a pledge of peace and of possible reconciliation in the future. Sir, the East of Europe belongs to the Oriental Europeans; the Slav countries belong to the Slavs. Russia, the only Slav country which has succeeded in creating a free power independent, and not destitute of strength, is bound by all its national aspirations and historical traditions to free its oppressed brethren of the same race, who are misunderstood and despised by Western Europe, and given over to all the ignominy, all the atrocity, of the Turkish domination. It is not a question of territorial conquests for Russia; it is a question of calling to an independent existence (political and social) all these different Slav groups which people the Balkan peninsula. There is no idea of annexation, but certainly it is not antagonists which we seek to create; and all these Slav peoples should be, and will be, attached to Russia by the moral ties of religious, national, and physiological unity. Neither Western Europe in general, nor England in particular, have anything to do with this; there is not

an iota of British interest which is hazarded. The East has its reason and its right to exist; let it manage itself in its interior relations as it thinks proper.

If the West is not of this opinion, it is because apparently it is not the question of the right or the security of the English domination in India which engross its attention, but even the existence of Russia and of the Slav world, of which for its part it would not like to see looming in the horizon a future of prosperity and power. But I think that Europe would do better to reconcile itself to this fact, and not to complicate the situation by fomenting in the Slav race, which is quite placable, sentiments of hatred and vengeance.

Whatever circumstances exist, let us be on the side of justice and truth. This is the only way to arrive at a solution of all the questions here below, and to conquer the falsehood raised up by modern civilisation into a real power of the first order, decorated by the title of Public Opinion! The Grand Chancellor of this new Majesty, the High Priest of this new idol, is, without doubt, Beaconsfield.

It is to be hoped, sir, that the united efforts of courageous men like yourself, Messrs. Freeman, Gladstone, Forster, and others, will succeed at last to cause the moral yoke to fall which weighs on so many minds and on the consciences of a great part of your countrymen.

Be so good as to accept the expression of my gratitude and of my most sincere respect.

Moscow. T. AKSAKOFF.

One of the criticisms on my book which has diverted me the most, is that which has appeared in the *Jewish World.*

The reviewer opens his attack upon me with the well-known quotation from Job, "O that mine enemy would write a book!" but as I, in the preface to my work, had made use of the same weapon against my opponents, he was by custom precluded from having recourse to it. My speeches and book have, according to this judicious and impartial critic, "excited by turns in the world at large contempt, pity, disgust, and ridicule." I have even, he says,

been guilty of the heinous and unparalleled offence of having "had the audacity to forward manuscripts to Mr. Gladstone!" and, as I freely acknowledge that I did send some MSS. to him, I suppose I must expect a species of moral crucifixion at the hands of the Editor of the *Jewish World*, as it is no longer in the power of the Jews to inflict that punishment corporeally, or to make girdles of the entrails of their victims, as I have related from *Gibbon's* celebrated work. He, however, is mistaken in saying that the Liberal leaders whom I have attacked "simply requite his egotistic impertinence with scornful silence," for Mr. Gladstone, in receiving a copy of my speech, wrote a letter by return of post to the Editor of the *Northern Ensign*, in which he says respecting me, "I shall be sorry to lose a man of his courage, assiduity, and talent;" and, if this is Mr. Gladstone's way of showing his scorn, I wonder how he expresses his appreciation? This Shimei of the press then says, "But for the fact that the production is a unique psychological curiosity, and will afford amusement to many, we should regard it as a melancholy exhibition of indiscretion, to be passed over with contempt," but an author whose work is a unique curiosity, which will afford amusement to many, may justly be proud of his success; and, as the reviewer cannot explain why it is so unique a curiosity, nor what sources of amusement from his point of view the book contains, which alone would justify him logically, according to his own thoery, in treating the work otherwise than with silent contempt, what excuse can he give his readers for cruelly inflicting on them about 230 lines of criticism on a production so utterly undeserving of notice?

In the very next sentence, however, the reviewer most inconsistently says: "The most notable part of this unparalleled work is a chapter which Jews cannot fail to *enjoy with intense avidity;*" but, if my chapter on the Jews is the most notable, it grammatically follows that other chapters are either notable or more notable. Again, in these days when everyone complains of uniformity and tameness, it is no small compliment to be told that one has produced an "unparalleled work;" and, if "Jews cannot fail to enjoy with intense avidity" the chapter which I have written respecting

them, my book ought to have a very large circulation from Jewish purchasers alone, and if they have any gratitude they should send me a testimonial for writing something which they "*enjoy with intense avidity.*"

Further on, my Jewish critic says "that in the uncontrollable bitterness he manifests against the founders of the Jewish race, and the heroes of subsequent Old Testament times, he is shaking to their foundations the very pillars which sustain Christianity in common with Judaism," and "shattering the fundamental supports of Christianity;" but, if I am such a moral Samson, and if my book is so powerful and dangerous, surely it would have been better to open fire against me by reversing Job's exclamation, and saying, "O that mine enemy had not written this book!"

We are then told, "The Jews . . are now transfixed by the poisoned arrows of his insensate anger;" but, if this is so, my skill as an archer must be considerably greater than my reviewer pretends in the first part of his remarks.

Whilst the rest of the human race, and especially the Americans, have the most supreme contempt for the Jews, as I have shown in my book, the Editor of the *Jewish World* has the modesty to say that the Creator "fashioned us [the Jews] in a mould superior to that in which the rest of mankind was cast." As regards external appearance and manner, the Jews are the most unprepossessing race that ever existed; and as regards distinction in literature, science, philosophy, art, &c., they occupy a very humble place.

There are about six millions of Jews in the world, and there are about thirty-six millions of Frenchmen; and, if my reviewer's statement of the superiority of the Jewish race to any other was correct, in biographical dictionaries there should be considerably more than a sixth of the number of Jewish names as there are of French names (deducting French Jews from the other French names, and adding them to the rest of the Jewish race); but I question whether the ratio of French, English, or German names in any biographical dictionary would not be at least sixty times as numerous, or ten times as great in proportion to numbers, as

those of Jews; whilst as to great geniuses, where is the Jewish Shakespeare, Milton, Newton, Homer, Socrates, Plato, Voltaire, Racine, Moliere, Göethe, Raffaelle, Rubens, Beethoven, or Canova? Echo answers, Where?

I am subsequently called "this matchless traducer of our people," and again I have to thank my critic for the honour he confers on me in stating that I am "matchless," even although this matchlessness is, in his view, of a Satanic cast. I am also, he says, "*the prince of political buffoons*," and I am actuated by "fiendish hate;" but it appears that I am "insane," and "a ranting fanatic," from what is stated a little later; and if I can write a book shaking to their foundations the very "pillars which sustain Christianity" when supposed to be in a state of mental aberration, what could I not do if, through the "condign punishment" which I have received from the *Jewish World*, I should recover my reason? "Se chiusi m'occidete aperte che farete" as Metastasio says.

I must, however, observe that my reviewer has not disproved even one of the numerous accusations I have brought against the Jewish race, and for which I have cited the highest authorities, and especially Gibbon's charge that they massacred 460,000 of the inhabitants of Cyrene and Cyprus, with whom they dwelt in treacherous friendship, and made girdles of the entrails of their victims; nor has he justified his co-religionists from my charge of totally disregarding their own laws; in short, his reply is in accordance with the well-known instructions of a sharp Jewish attorney to a barrister who had to defend a rascally client, "No case; abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

The Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* writes, in reply to a correspondent, as follows respecting my book:—"Can our correspondent not see that the very virulence of the attack and the vileness of the language save us the trouble of an answer? A writer like this scribbling Baronet has unmistakably 'rabies' reflected in his savage look. If you are not willing to knock down a mad dog, you simply go out of his way. Nobody mistakes the brute. Why, therefore, should we lose our time with commenting upon a book which simply excites

loathing, and to which no rational being will give the slightest heed?—ED. *J. C.*" As the Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* says "no rational being will give the slightest heed" to my book, it logically follows that in his opinion the Editor of the *Jewish World*, who has given the greatest "heed" to my work, is not a rational being.

In answer to a second attack on me, I wrote as follows, as fast as my pen would dash over my paper:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "JEWISH WORLD."

SIR,—I received last night a copy of the *Jewish World* of the 26th inst., containing upwards of two columns and a half of a second editorial attack on my "Defence of Russia," to which I have to reply with much greater brevity as follows:—

In the first place, I protest against your stating that I admitted that the generations of Jews who immediately succeeded those who crucified Jesus, were less unjust and inhuman. I merely said "*it may be alleged*" that this was the case, but I immediately proceed to prove it was not the case, and that they became infinitely worse.

You charge me with quoting "garbled extracts from Gibbon." Why not prove this, if you can, by giving the entire passages and showing that my quotations did not fairly represent the opinions of the author; and you give no evidence whatever of your reckless assertion that those allegations are "gross exaggerations." You pretend that whatever atrocities the Jews may have committed were done in self-defence; but Gibbon distinctly states that the "horrid cruelties of the Jews in the cities of Egypt, of Cyprus, and of Cyrene, where they dwelt *in treacherous friendship* with the unsuspecting natives," "shocked humanity," and even in any case in which they were first attacked, none but Jewish fiends would "make girdles of the entrails of their victims," or "saw them asunder," as Gibbon states. There is not a scintilla of evidence that the Jews who dragged the body of the Patriarch of Constantinople through the streets in 1821 and threw it into the sea, or the 600 Jews who beat out the brains of the wounded Greeks after the battle of Navacta, were, as you in the most brazen manner

assert, "unvoluntary agents in the melancholy scene," but, if so, they should have preferred death to committing murder; and on the contrary, one of them boasted that he had despatched 68 victims. You then quote my reproach that the Jews do not perform the various ceremonies of the Mosaic Law, but you do not even attempt to deny the fact or to give reasons why they continuously disobey in almost every particular the law by which they profess to be bound; but as the Israelites universally neglected to perform even the rite of circumcision during the forty years in the wilderness, this disregard of their own law is characteristic and hereditary.

You afterwards take me to task for my attack on Baron Henry de Worms. Now, I find on inquiry that his family obtained, in August, 1874, permission from the Queen to call themselves barons; but I maintain that Englishmen usually do not use foreign titles, even when they have inherited them through a long line of ancestors, like Mr. De Lisle, of Garendon, Marquis of Chateaunay, in France; the Duke of Hamilton, Duke of Chatelherault, in France, and others, or when foreign titles have been conferred on their families for distinguished services, as in the case of the Duke of Wellington, Duke of Cuidad Rodrigo, Charlotte Mary Lady Bridport, Duchess of Bronte, &c.; still less when these foreign titles have been bought for money, or obtained by rigging the market and financing foreign loans; and neither Mrs. Jodrell, who is Countess of Cape St. Vincent, Mr. De La Poer, who is a Roman baron, Sir Horace St. Paul, who is Count St. Paul, Mrs. Stapleton Bretherton, who is a marchesa, Mr. Walrond, who is a marquis and a grandee of the first class in Spain, nor even Sir Francis Goldsmid, ever use their foreign titles; and perhaps their reason is because they consider exotic titles degraded by being bought by Hebrew financiers. In fact, many Englishmen, such as Mr. Mackenzie, who is a Spanish Count and a Portuguese Marquis, do not even take the trouble of getting their names inserted at the end of the peerage. You subsequently say that I "endeavour to tear into shreds the statistics quoted by him" (Baron de Worms), but you do not even try to show that the Baron's ludicrously erroneous statistics are

right. You "challenge me to adduce a single instance in which we (the Jews) have taken the initiative in any conflict with Christians"; but I have quoted several, and especially the unprovoked cruelties which they committed in the cities of Egypt, Cyprus, and Cyrene, and the dastardly and fiendish wickedness of their conduct to the Greek wounded after the battle of Navacta.

You not only deny that Jesus Christ was crucified at all, but you add that "We believe the story of the life and death of Jesus to be for the most part mythical." The whole civilised world, however (except Jews), Christian and infidel, firmly believe that Christ was crucified by the Jews, and independently of Christian evidence, there is abundance of pagan and hostile evidence to prove the fact. Neither Julian the Apostate, Gibbon, Voltaire, Hume, or any other freethinker ever attempted to deny the fact of the crucifixion, and even Mahomet believed that Christ was a prophet, and he would not therefore have put him to death as the Jews did.

It would be much easier to prove that black is white, or that two and two make five (to anyone but a Jew) than to disprove the fact of the crucifixion, and all I need add on this point is to apply to you what Byron said of Bishop Berkeley:

> "When Bishop Berkeley said there was no matter,
> It was no matter what he said."

You say you are a nation, but no statement could be more absurd. Nationality cannot exist without the colloquial use of the same language by all the individuals of the nation, whilst the majority of Jews know no more of Hebrew than the majority of Roman Catholics know of Latin; one proof of which is that all your newspapers are in European languages and none in Hebrew, and the mere identity of religion does not make the Russian, Turkish, French, English, German, Italian, and other Jews a nation any more than the gipsies of the world or the Quakers form a nation, in fact, even when the language, race, and religion are identical, and the people reside side by side, as in the case of Belgium and France, they do not always form one nation, and nothing would induce a Belgian to adopt French nationality. Surely you would hardly venture to assert that the six millions of Jews throughout the world really in their hearts desire to return to Judea, for

it must be observed that the Jews are only a portion of the Israelites, just as the people of London and Middlesex are only a portion of the English people, and yet you talk as if all Palestine rightfully belonged to you. Your race might easily buy up Judea, but if you went there you would not understand each other's language, it would be impossible for six millions to live there, and you would infallibly starve, unless, indeed, you were miraculously fed by manna and quails from heaven.

You accuse me of "shaking the pillars of Christianity to their foundation," because, for instance, I express the horror which I feel at the conduct of the Israelites to the tribe of Benjamin, of whom they exterminated all the men, women, and children, except 600 men, and at the massacre of 42,000 flying Ephraimites by the Gileadites, merely because the Ephraimites said, "Ye Gileadites aie fugitives of Ephraim among the Ephraimites, and among the Manassites," but I defy you to quote any text from the Old Testament which justifies either of these more than Turkish atrocities. As the Old Testament tells us that the Lord said, "I have left me seven thousand in Israel, ALL the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which has not kissed him," there is abundant proof that at that time at least only an infinitesimal minority of all the Israelites believed in the national religion, and the overwhelming majority were not only disbelievers in the Mosaic dispensation, but believers in the hostile creed of Baal. Taking an average of the twelve tribes, the 7,000 in question would only give a dividend of less than 600 Jews who were faithful to the Mosaic law, but, strangely enough, Jehu is represented as having gathered all the followers of Baal, without one single exception, into the house of Baal, where he treacherously massacred them; and to hold the whole of the Israelites, except 7,000, the house of Baal must have been infinitely larger than St. Peter's at Rome, or the Crystal Palace, whilst it seems strange that not one of the whole of the people of Israel was intelligent enough not to suspect Jehu's stratagem, and that there was no sick, infirm, or dying man or pregnant woman in all Israel, who was not able and willing to go up to the house of Baal, and this murder of say a million of his countrymen is the more abominable

since Jehu lived and died an idolater, and "took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel."

Even Jews, as will appear from the following extracts from a letter in the *Jewish World*, signed "Barnard D. Isaacs," speak of "the delusions, the shams, which rob Judaism of its better part, and make it appear a snare and an imposture; the watchmen of Judaism hide themselves, being afraid to view the inroad of infidelity, to mark the progress of humbug." The *obscene passages* in the Jewish ritual must be expunged. Such *crimes* as suggested by the confessional of Kippur must be removed from a book lisping the Eternal's praise, for it debases the pure and vitiates the innocent—in a word, it makes the mind the residence of low-thoughtedness, and the heart the domicile of depravity."

It thus clearly appears that I, whom you term "the matchless traducer" of your race, cannot say anything more severe of you than the thoughtful, intelligent, and honest among you say of yourselves, and that, in spite of your Selicoth, Hapthorah, Sedrahs, Hosanna Rabbahs, and other long prayers, you are but whited sepulchres, as Christ said of you. You scrupulously purchase Talysim and Sepher Torahs, you eat your Challoth, and you slaughter your animals in a manner which is a species of vivisection; but this is a mere whitening of the outside of the cup and the platter, and avails you nothing against the progress of infidelity and schism in your own fold. It is notorious that marriages are now taking place, contrary to your law and customs, between Jews and Christians, and in many other respects your co-religionists are rapidly forsaking their faith. To risk a *Jeu* de mots; It is, however, hardly a flattering coincidence, that in the case of these *Jeu* d'amour marriages, the Jewish bride, who, of course, is married from disinterested affection, has always a large fortune, and it can hardly be said of the husband, que son bonheur est en Jew.

You yourself, in a leading article, use the following just but severe language:—

"It is an unfortunate fact that not only are our English co-religionists wofully deficient in general theological knowledge, but their acquaintance with Jewish literature is of the most infinitesimal character. This ignorance is owing, to a considerable extent,

to a want of enthusiasm, and even common interest, in our ancient literatrue. Yet it is due also in no small degree to a lack of competent teachers to expound it."

I have further to observe, that though the Jews (who for centuries disbelieved in a future world) pretend that theirs is the only true faith, they churlishly, selfishly, and ungenerously refuse to make any efforts, or to spend any of that gold which, like Aaron's calf, is their idol, to convert the Christian or even the heathen Gentiles, and even discourage conversions, which is an ungrateful return for the enormous sums the Christians have lavished in the hopeless task of converting them. Every Hebrew convert to Christianity must cost at least a thousand pounds, and in this and in other cases it seems to me clear that Le *Jeu* ne vaut pas la chandelle.

As to the false accusations brought against the Roumanians and Servians for their conduct to the Jews, I now append from the columns of your own paper nearly the whole of an article which you have copied from the *Jewish Messenger*, which proves that your race is infinitely worse treated in Morocco than even according to your own untrue statements in Russia and in the Principalities and Servia, yet you enthusiastically support these cruel, oppressive, and contemptuous Mussulmans, who hate and despise you, as appears by the following quotation from your paper from Adrianople:—

"A striking feature of the Turkish war is the alacrity with which the Jewish population of Turkey respond to the calls made upon them. In some of the larger towns the Rabbis go from house to house to collect subscriptions for the wounded, and the utmost enthusiasm prevails."

A correspondent of the *Jewish Messenger* furnishes that paper with an interesting article on the position of the Moorish Jews, from which we extract the most important features.

"As to the language of the country, there are not more than two or three in every town who are able to read and write it; the Mohammedans consider it sacrilege for their writing to be defiled by a Jew's hand, or tongue.

Most of the native Jews have such primitive ideas that they prefer supporting clerical or religious instruction to the utter loss of the secular. Many even refuse to allow their children to go to

schools, preferring to have them brought up as rabbis. At Mogador in particular, the schools are badly attended and worse conducted; the leaders of the community take no interest in furtherance of secular education, and many of them are quite opposed to it. Thus the school in this town has not yet furnished any qualified pupils since its establishment, although much has been spent on it by the alliance and the Board of Deputies.

"The native Jews of Morocco have a great many disabilities against them. They are only allowed to follow such trades as no Mohammedans will do, and even their shops are only to be allowed to be at places where they have little or no intercourse with their Moorish neighbours. They are not allowed to reside outside the Ghetto, and, where such does not exist, their quarters are generally separated from the rest of the inhabitants. A Jew must not wear shoes in any part of the town except the Mullah or Ghetto, nor ride about the town. No Jew is allowed to ride a horse, nor wear the same garb as the Mohammedans. They are not allowed to go to public baths, nor visit such places of recreation as are frequented by Mohammedans. They are not deemed fit witnesses to give evidence before a court of law, and, were a case with a Mohammedan to be decided against a Jew, the latter cannot murmur against the sentence. No Jew can hold a public office under government (except that of Rabbi or Sheik), and even rabbis' evidence, or deeds, are not considered legal if they are unfavourable to a Mohammedan. If a Jew be imprisoned or bastinadoed, he must pay the fees of the executioner; pay for his lodging in prison, and also the entrance as well as the outgoing fees. In case of refusal, his clothes are taken from him and left in the prison until he calls to redeem them. Jews must not sell any article of provisions above the rate fixed for them by a government official appointed for that purpose; and, recently, a Jewish butcher was subjected to the torture of three thousand lashes for selling meat at a slight advance over a fixed price, which he did in order to compensate for his loss in a beast which turned out *trefa*, or unfit for food.

"All work for government, such as tailoring, shoemaking, tinkering, scavenging, &c., must be done by Jews at a low rate

of pay; which, however, the workmen never get, especially in Morocco city, where men and women of all trades are obliged to work most of their time for the government, and have work distributed at their homes, whether the women can do it or not. Many poor young women are compelled to quit their homes and go to work for a governor, or a sheriff, at his own house, and should these take a fancy to the poor woman, she is compelled to change her religion and remain with her seducer on the mere evidence of his statement that she wished to embrace Mohammedanism; the protestations to the contrary are not believed.

"In cases of work, neither Sabbaths nor festivals are respected; the lash and prison being often employed to enforce obedience.

"In most towns, the Jewish burial-grounds are not allowed to be walled in, and when a burial-ground is filled, they are not allowed to buy another, but bury one body over the other. The cemetery in Morocco city is either five or six deep already. Where Ghettos exist, the cemetery is within its walls, or close under them, in order not to contaminate the Mohammedan passers by.

"At Morocco, where executions of criminals often take place, it is the Jews' task to salt the head, or limbs, of the culprits, and hang the same to the walls for public inspection, whence the name of 'Mullah' (salt), given to the Ghettos in general."

It is clear that the Jewish race will for centuries submit to a life of humiliation, which no other race in the world would endure for a moment. The Menmonites emigrated from Russia to America only because they were dissatisfied at being drawn for the conscription for the army, and even the Circassians and other natives have emigrated for comparatively trifling reasons, and if the Jews of Morocco had one spark of manliness they would emigrate too.

Deal with my facts and arguments if you can; but you are welcome to abuse me, for I consider your praise as censure, and your censure praise.

I now take leave of the Editor of the *Jewish World*, with my best compliments and thanks.

Yours obediently,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

POSTSCRIPT.

THE AUTHOR'S FAREWELL.

THE wounded soldier, as long as it is physically possible, rushes forward in the excitement of the battle, reckless or unconscious of the hurts he may have received, and though I have fought out unmoved this contest on behalf of Russia and the Christians against the Turcophiles till now, exposed to an incessant fire of artillery and musketry from the Press, including all the weapons at their disposal, such as abuse, ridicule, and slander, the time has now come when, in a temporary pause in the hostilities of which I have been the object, I have had time to examine my wounds, and I feel tempted to exclaim, "Que diable avais-je à faire dans cette galère?" for I have received hardly any thanks from those I have attempted to serve, and volleys of red-hot shot from those who are opposed to me; in fact, an Irish paper says that I am the best abused man in England, and that my critics have treated me with more severity than fairness.

Mr. "Punch's" short, pithy, and sagacious advice to those about to marry is, perhaps, even more applicable to those about to publish —"Don't." At any rate, I have little reason to be gratified with this first and last literary venture, for I have found that, besides an enormous expense, made up of what the French call *comptes d'apothecaire*, I have received hardly anything but the most frantic abuse from my opponents, whilst I have been almost wholly ignored by those who are supposed to agree with me in the main. Even in Biblical times it was said, "Of making of books there is no end," and if that could be said in those days, how much more true is it now, when tens of thousands of volumes appear every year, and even successful authors put the extinguisher on their own works by the amazing celerity with which they produce

others, whilst not even the almost unparalleled success of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of recent years has rescued it from oblivion.

If literary production, except the necessary ephemeral works, such as newspapers, entirely ceased, there are infinitely more works of value in the world, on almost every conceivable topic, past, present, and future, than the greatest *helluo librorum* could possibly read, working twenty hours a day for a hundred years; and one almost feels that writing a new book is penance and a species of impertinence and of treason against those admirable writers whose works fill the mind with enthusiasm in youth, stimulate it to exertion in middle life, and afford the best possible solace in old age.

One is apt to wonder that any literary market can exist, for instance, for the thousands of volumes of milk-and-water novels, travels, poems, &c., that appear every year, while the matchless works of Byron, Dickens, Thackeray, and others are to the present generation comparatively unknown, for, excepting that since the time of these writers we have railways and telegraphs everywhere, their books might have been written yesterday; and an ounce of their charming productions is worth tons of ordinary literature, besides what is unknown, though it may be old, is as new to you as that which is published to-day.

Who can think over the intense and rapt enjoyment that one has derived from "Childe Harold" or from the "Christmas Carol" without preferring a second, a third, or a tenth perusal of these matchless works, to a first reading of a modern novel or poem? And if one was fairly to estimate, by the number and intensity of the beatings of one's pulse when one has read them, the debt of gratitude which one owes to these great writers, which of us would not feel that, measured by a fair pecuniary standard, all that we possess would not repay our obligations to them, and that if we attempted to pay twenty shillings in the pound we should be hopelessly bankrupt?

That charming writer, Jeffrey, thus beautifully expresses similar thoughts to these:—"The works of the best models are continually before the eyes, and their accumulated glory in the remembrance;

the very variety of the sorts of excellence which are constantly obtruded on the notice renders excellence itself cheap and vulgar in the estimation. One is disheartened, too, by the extreme insignificance of anything we can expect to contribute, when compared with the great store which is already in possession of the public. It is knowledge which distracts by its variety, and satiates by its abundance, and generates by its communication that cold and dark spirit of depreciation and derision *which revenges on those whom it possesses the pangs which it inflicts upon those on whom it is exerted.*"

It does seem to me unjust and un-English that, when a writer who has been, in a literary point of view, almost silent for the greater portion of his life, reluctantly sits down to compose a work on the burning question of the day, as no one else is able and willing to champion the cause which he honestly thinks right, adverse critics should endeavour to scarify him, or, rather, skin him alive, and that they should even insult him, as the *Birmingham Gazette* has done, by calling him an idiot, knowing well that this is a wilful falsehood. As idiot is even a more opprobrious term than fool, I would advise the courteous writer of this Billingsgate Brummagem journal to remember the text "Whoso calleth his brother, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire," and his insolence certainly deserves that the critical furnace should be made "seven times hotter than it is wont to be heated."

The *Saturday Reviler*, which becomes waste paper every Monday, however, carries off the palm for ignoring or nipping in the bud any new and earnest writer whose views are opposed to their own; and I suppose that no other journal in any age or country has, so to speak, tomahawked so many authors, or could show as many literary scalps. I have neither written to glorify myself, nor with the least expectation or desire to make money; but some of my critics have treated me worse than a Bashi-Bazouk would behave to a Bulgarian; whilst, had I written in favour of the fiendish Turks, I should have received from them the most indiscriminating applause, or had Baron de Worms written in favour of the Russians and Christians, he would have been abused

like a pickpocket. All, they say, is barren and worthless in my work, from Dan to Beersheba, and no good can come out of such a Nazareth. Some of these critics are utterly incapable of writing an original work; their business is to carp, to cavil, and to find fault, and if they literally kill an occasional Keats, or even any smaller game—for, like French sportsmen, they do not disdain to bag a linnet or a tom-tit—they have no more compunction than if they had trodden on a worm. However, I have set some traps for them, and have already caught one or two napping. Let a new author make a single mistake in a quotation, an argument, or a figure, though in ninety-nine cases he may be right, this hundredth instance in which he is really or supposedly wrong, even though it may be corrected in the errata, is eagerly fastened upon, and the author is held up to scorn, hatred, or ridicule for a matter perhaps of little or no importance, and one who cannot be easily put down by fair argument is suffocated in the wet blanket of pretended critical contempt.

It is quixotic and useless for any one to struggle against wind and tide. If my countrymen will not even believe that Dunnet Head is, as is the fact, much farther north than John O'Groat's house, neither will they be persuaded by any amount of facts, figures, and arguments that the cause of Russia and the Christians is just, "although one rose from the dead," and those who are determined not even to hear the Russian and Christian side of the question act I suppose on the saying, "When ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." I will, however, mention yet another fact in favour of Russia, namely, that Russian Armenia has always been exempted from the conscription; but two regiments of Armenian volunteers serve with the Russian army. Some of my critics crow over me for my favourable anticipations for the Russian cause, in consequence of their temporary want of success, but the capture of Erzeroum and the approaching fall of Plevna and Kars are a triumphant answer.

As a contrast to the admirable conduct of the Russians, I quote the following from the *Times* correspondent, dated Bogot, October 30th :—

"Dr. Douglas and Dr. Vachell (taken prisoners at Telis) are treated with the greatest courtesy. They have capital quarters, and dine and breakfast with the Grand Duke Nicholas, who shows them marked attention.

"I visited the field hospitals here in their company this afternoon. Dr. Douglas authorises me to state that he saw the Russian dead horribly mutilated after their first repulse at Telis. *Many were headless, all were stripped naked,* and he saw one body of a man who had received a comparatively slight wound from the Turkish fire, and had then been shot five times in a circle through the breast by a revolver, held so close that the powder had burnt the flesh. He is positive that the man was murdered, as his first wound was too slight to cause death. *Both these English doctors have travelled from Constantinople to Plevna, and have only seen or heard of three Russian prisoners in the Turkish lines. The Turkish authorities, they state, declare that they do not want English doctors, but English soldiers; that the wounded are of no use, as they cannot fight any more, and are only a useless burden to the State.*"

"Englishmen who could not endure to see the Turks gouging out the eyes and cutting off the extremities, and then severing the heads of the Russian wounded, and English ladies who would faint if they saw the most inhuman murderer hung, strangely enough can not only listen unmoved to accounts of the massacre with refinements of cruelty far outdoing the practice of Red Indian or other savages, but applaud and sympathise with these Turkish devils in human form."

Here is yet another photograph of Turkish atrocities from the *Times'* correspondent at Bogot, November 4th :—

"Late in the afternoon several hundreds of Turkish wounded came through this village *en route* to the Russian hospitals in the rear. This train presented a strong contrast to the fate of the Russian wounded at the first attack on Telis, *not one of whom was received in the hospitals in the Turkish lines. All those on the field were murdered by the Turks.* The barbarity of the Turks is not confined to the treatment of the Russian wounded; they do not behave much better to their own. . . . I am informed by

the English surgeons captured at Telis that the wounds (of the 4,500 Turks) were full of maggots, and the men covered with vermin. Some of them had been lying wounded for weeks before being sent to Orchanie without bandages; yet when the English ambulance proposed to enter Plevna with a large quantity of bandages and other hospital stores, Osman Pasha refused them admission to send on the supplies. . . . In consequence of the refusal of Osman Pasha, the English surgeons were compelled to establish their ambulance at Orchanie, two days' ride from Plevna."

It thus appears on the clearest evidence of Englishmen whose sympathies were with the Turks, that no more barbarous, inhuman, and fiendish scoundrels than the Ottomans ever disgraced humanity, and that they wilfully withhold from their own wounded all medical or other relief, and thus wilfully and intentionally inflict on them a certain and horrible death, merely to save expense.

As to Russian literature, I extract the following sentences from the *Westminster Review* for October:—"After the Crimean war, in which it must be candidly confessed the country (Russia) exhibited to the rest of Europe a figure by no means contemptible, scholars began to pay some attention to this neglected language. . . . The Russian ballads certainly cannot be said to rival in beauty the Servian, but they possess very great merit, and one cannot help being struck by the great abundance of them . . . The Slavonic races may justly be proud of their ballads. Since Poushkin's attempt, the historical drama, based entirely upon the English, has been very successfully cultivated . . . With the Russians, the English novel of the realistic type is the favourite model. In this branch of literature French influences have hardly been felt at all. . . . No more pathetic tale than the 'Gentleman's Seat' ('Doorianskov Guesdo') can be shown in the literature of any country. The branches of literature which the Russians have cultivated with the most success are lyric poetry, the drama, the novel, and history, especially that of their own country and kindred Slavonic nations. Nor must we deny them considerable

merit as philologists, both in the Slavonic languages and in those of the East generally. . . . We may hope that, together with their noble language, their literature may become more and more developed."

For myself, I have had more than enough of an ungrateful task, and now I have only as an author to bid my readers a final adieu.

NOTE RESPECTING LORD BEACONSFIELD.

Mr. D'Israeli's first speech in the House of Commons was, as is well known, a complete failure, and he sat down utterly discomfited, saying, "The day will come when the House will hang upon my words." The coldness and superciliousness of the House has, however, permanently silenced many other men—and, amongst others, the celebrated Mr. Single-Speech Hamilton, whose sole and only oration was a miracle of talent—especially those who have a vein of pathos and sentiment in their natures, or what dull, cold, phlegmatic, and matter-of-fact people who have no soul, and who, so to speak, prefer moral tripe and heavy wet to champagne and turtle, term contemptuously humanitarian *gush*, especially if accompanied by that gesticulation which is so natural and appropriate, and by that forcible and varied elocution which the House considers theatrical. Hardly anyone in the House of Commons, except Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, ever ventures to attempt to touch the feelings, and they do so rarely and in homœopathic doses with great brevity and restraint, yet more than half the charm and a large portion of the effect of true oratory is produced by that "touch of nature which makes the whole world kin," and whoever does not appreciate and feel that influence lacks one of the greatest enjoyments which it is possible even to imagine, and is devoid of that emotional intuition which is sometimes a better guide than dry logic and pure reason. Though Mr. D'Israeli soon acquired a very high reputation as a speaker, his oratorical fireworks, to me, are often laboured and ineffective, and seldom impromptu; and on the occasion of the death of the Duke of Wellington, he plagiarised

in the coolest and most unblushing manner from the funeral oration which Thiers pronounced on Marshal St. Cyr, pretending that he had forgotten that he had read it, just as he affects to forget that in the midst of the Crimean War he sent a message through Count Seebach to the Emperor of Russia to say that he expected to regain power immediately, and that he would then "establish an agreement (with Russia) by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston, which would hasten, if necessary, in spite of France, the conclusion of peace." On the occasion of the funeral oration when he forgot the difference between the literary *meum* and *tuum*, a well-known wit wrote the following lines:—

"In sounding great Wellington's praise,
Dizzy's grief and his truth both appear,
For he shed an abundance of *Thiers*,
Which was certainly meant for *St. Cyr.*'

NOTE IN ANSWER TO THE CHALLENGE OF THE "JEWISH WORLD."

The editor of the *Jewish World* having accused me of maligning the heroes of the Old Testament and the Mosaic law, I subjoin a few more random notes on these subjects.

"Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf in the morning, he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil."

Moses deserted his wife, Zipporah, and two sons, but Jethro, his father-in-law, brought them back to him.

"If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money." In other words, you may brutally murder your male or female slave, provided you do it so that he or she lives one or two days.

"Thou shalt not revile *the gods*."

"Neither shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause."

The Israelites seem to have been at no pains to preserve the two tables of testimony "written with the finger of God," for though

Moses sacrilegiously broke them, the fragments were worth preserving.

"Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath Day."

"It shall be a perpetual statute throughout all your dwellings that ye eat neither fat nor blood."

"Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," so that the Mosaic law recognised the existence of witches, which no sane man or woman now believes to be the case. "Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy . they shall be your bondmen for ever," so that slavery and slave-dealing are not only permitted but enjoined by the Mosaic dispensation.

In Numbers v. it is commanded "that when a woman has committed adultery, or when her husband wrongfully suspects that she has committed it, he shall bring her before the priest, and after she has drunk some bitter water, if she is guilty her thigh shall rot and her belly shall swell." One is curious to know whether this practice is still in force among the Jews and whether these consequences universally ensue.

In Numbers viii. 4 we are told that Moses made a candlestick "according unto the pattern which the Lord had showed Moses." Is this candlestick still extant?

Moses seems to have married two Midianitish wives, contrary to his own law, namely, Zipporah, daughter of Jethro, and a daughter of Raguel, and he also married an Ethiopian woman (Numbers xii. 1), and a daughter of a Kenite (Judges i. 16).

In Numbers xi. 10 we are told that the Israelites were so tired of manna that "Moses heard the people weep throughout their families, every man in the door of his tent." A couple of millions of people blubbering in this way like spoilt children, because they did not like the food which God gave them, must have been an extraordinary sight; however, their complaints had the effect of inducing God to give them quails, and we are told, verse 32, that the quails were "two cubits high upon the face of the earth," and that "the people stood up all that day and

all that night and all the next day" (say 48 hours, without sleep or food), and that some of them only gathered 10 homers, whilst with such an abundance they should have gathered many cart-loads, and far more than they could eat before the quails putrefied.

In Numbers xiv. 1 we are told that after Caleb and Joshua had returned from spying out the promised land, and had seen the giants and other marvels, "all the congregation lifted up their voice and cried, and the people wept that night"—a practice which appears to be confined, as regards men, to the "peculiar people."

What has become of the "book of the wars of the Lord," mentioned in Numbers xxi. 14?

In Deuteronomy vii. 14, 15, it is stated, as to the Israelites, "There shall not be a male or a female barren among you, or among your cattle. And the Lord will put away from thee all sickness." Is this so now? In that case the Jews need have no doctors or chemists.

Deuteronomy xxi. 18—21 commands the Israelites to stone to death rebellious and stubborn children. Do they still enforce this law?

This command, it will be observed, is not permissive, but obligatory, so that the Jews are absolutely bound to stone to death any son or daughter who, for instance, marries in defiance of their authority, or who even goes to the theatre, or refuses to go to the synagogue when ordered to do so by their parents.

Of course, any Jew who carried out this law would be hung, but a Jew is bound to submit to this trifling inconvenience, for he ought to obey God rather than man.

When Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were ordered to fall down and worship the image which Nebuchadnezzar set up, they preferred going into a burning fiery furnace, which is an infinitely more painful death than being hung; and so Jews should observe the whole Mosaic law without regard to consequences.

Chapter xxii. ordains that if a man accuses his bride of not being a maid, and physical proofs cannot be produced by her, she is to be stoned to death; but medical men are agreed that such proofs cannot always be supplied.

Chapter xxv. commands the Israelitish women to marry their deceased husband's brother (do they still adhere to this commandment?), whereas with us marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which is precisely the same relationship, is illegal.

Chapter xxviii., verse 68, says, "Ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you"; but it is difficult to understand how they could be sold if there were no buyers.

Rahab, the Gentile harlot, was one of the progenitors of David.

From Joshua xv. 63 it appears that "as for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah, could not drive them out, but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day," so that a large portion of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were Gentile Jebusites, and perhaps many of the Jews are of Jebusite origin.

Still, chapter xxi., verse 43, says, "And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which He sware to give unto their fathers, and they possessed it, and dwelt therein," but they could not have possessed the land which was occupied by these Jebusites, and by the Canaanites who continued to dwell in Ephraim and among the other tribes.

It is curious that Judges i. 21 states that it was the children of Benjamin, and not the children of Judah, who dwelt at Jerusalem to this day along with the Jebusites, and that the people of Judah could not drive out the people of the valley, because they had chariots of iron.

Judges vi. 1 informs us that the Lord delivered the Israelites into the hand of Midian seven years. This seems rather inconsistent with Numbers xxxi., which narrates the antecedent destruction of all the Midianites but the virgins. Judges viii. 27 states that "Gideon made an ephod thereof (of gold), and put it in his city, even in Ophrah, and all Israel went thither a whoring after it, which thing became a snare unto Gideon and to his house," yet the country was in quietness forty years under Gideon, and he is said to have died in a good (?) old age. Jephthah the judge, who murdered his daughter, was the son of an

harlot. Samson, again, took a wife from among the Philistines, the enemies and oppressors of the Israelites, contrary to the Mosaic law. It appears from Samuel i. 7, that because Hannah had no children "she wept and did not eat," and in Genesis xxxi. 1 Rachel says to Jacob, "Give me children or else I die." I am not aware that any woman of any other race but the Israelites was so anxious to have children, that she wished to die if she did not have, not only one child, but children. However, Rachel, as will be seen by verse 15, sold Jacob's matrimonial endearments to Leah for her son's mandrakes, and Jacob agreed to the bargain.

The Israelites must have had very large appetites, for according to 1 Samuel xiv. 34, "All the people brought every man his ox with him that night, and slew them there." There are certainly no other people but Israelites who would eat a whole ox, which seems a most wasteful proceeding. 1 Samuel xv. tells us, verse 2 and 3, that Amalek is to be exterminated, because 400 years before that nation "laid wait for him (Israel) in the way when he came out of Egypt."

King Saul, though wicked, still could prophesy. David, according to 1 Samuel xxix., was quite willing to fight with the Philistines against his own countrymen, but the Philistines would not allow him to do so. 2 Samuel i. refers to the slaughter of the Amalekites by David after the death of Saul, but by 1 Samuel xv. it appears that all the Amalekites were exterminated by Saul. Were they then restored to life to be slaughtered a second time?

A DEFENCE OF RUSSIA.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RUSSIA.

THE *Saturday Review* admits that "the multitude is, for the moment, on his (Mr. Gladstone's) side," that is to say, the bulk of the people of England are opposed to the "unspeakable Turk," and favourable to the heroic task now being performed by Russia, namely, enfranchising the Christians of Turkey from the cruelty and oppression of their Ottoman tyrants, whilst it is only the "west-end" and a parliamentary majority, chiefly returned by the influence of the licensed victuallers, who are in favour of Turkey, and hostile to the Turkish Christians and their Russian liberators. As the people as well as the government of Russia have been insulted and maligned in the most discreditable manner by the partisans of Turkey, I now come forward in their defence to show that they have been our most constant and faithful allies, that most of our greatest statesmen have, for generations, entertained the highest esteem and regard for that great country, and that Mr. Gladstone was justified in the recent debate in stating, "The Emperor of Russia is a gentleman, and a great benefactor to his people, and I believe the people of Russia to be capable of as noble sentiments as any people in Europe."

Thackeray, in his inimitable "Book of Snobs," gives the follow-

ing amusing satirical sketch of the idiotic lies which are invented in the clubs and told and believed in society about Russia. Captain Spitfire, R.N., who had been refused a ship by the Whigs, says :—"'Why wasn't the Princess Scragamoffsky at Lady Palmerston's party, Minns ?' 'Because *she can't show.*' 'And why can't she show ?' 'Shall I tell you, Minns, why she can't show ? The Princess Scragamoffsky's back is flayed alive, Minns. I tell you it's raw, sir. On Tuesday last, at 12 o'clock, three drummers of the Preobajinski Regiment arrived at Ashburnham House, and at half-past 12, in the yellow drawing-room at the Russian Embassy, before the ambassadress and four ladies' maids, the Greek Papa, and the Secretary of Embassy, Madame de Scragamoffsky received thirteen dozen. She was knouted, sir—knouted in the midst of England—in Berkeley Square, for having said that the Grand Duchess Olga's hair was red. And now, sir, will you tell me that Lord Palmerston ought to continue Minister ?' . . . Lord Palmerston's being sold to Russia, the exact number of roubles paid, by what house in the city, is a favourite theme with this kind of snob."

It will be remembered that the late Mr. Urquhart, formerly M.P., and previously Secretary of Embassy at Constantinople, maintained till his death that Lord Palmerston was bribed by Russia, and made the Crimean War in her interest.

A worse atrocity than the foregoing fictitious one occurred in the time of James I. Floyd had spoken slightingly of the Elector Palatine and his wife, and was, moreover, a Roman Catholic. It is difficult to understand how either of these circumstances was construed into a breach of privilege. The following was his sentence, pronounced by the Lords at the instance of the Commons : "To be degraded from his gentility, and held an infamous person ; to stand twice in the pillory, to be branded in the forehead with the letter K (knave), to be whipped at the cart's tail from the Fleet to Westminster Hall, to pay a fine of £5,000, and to be a prisoner in Newgate during his life." Blount's sentence about the same time was more moderate, imprisonment and hard labour for

Voltaire was so friendly to the Russians that, after the fall of Jassy, he wrote, "*Te Catharinam laudamus te Dominam confitemur.*"

To show the feelings of respect and regard which formerly prevailed in England towards Russia, I may well begin by quoting the fact that the great Lord Chatham once said, "I am altogether a Russ."

Mr. Pitt in 1791 proposed an increase of the navy in consequence of Russia having taken Oczakow.

Mr. Fox opposed this, and said, "In the war between Russia and Turkey, Turkey has been the aggressor. *I suspect that British influence has been used to induce Turkey to attack Russia.* I consider the terms proposed by the Empress Catherine extremely moderate. We had assisted Russia in 1771 in entering the Mediterranean. How absurd to stop her now when she was gathering the legitimate fruits of a policy we had supported. *The advances of Russia towards the South could never, he thought, be injurious to our commerce.*"

Mr. Burke, supporting Mr. Fox, maintained that "the attempt to bring the Turkish Empire into the European system was extremely new, and contrary to all former systems of the balance of power."

Pitt carried his motion by 228 to 131, an enormous majority; yet the strength of the minority induced him to modify his policy. He instructed Mr. Whitworth not to deliver a menacing note, and, in the course of the summer, a treaty between Russia and the Porte was concluded, by which the disputed fortress of Oczakow was given up to Russia; and, under similar circumstances, the present Ministry should defer to the views of the minority, especially as Mr. Cross, in his speech in the debate, estimated our numbers at only about 100, whilst we had a minority of 225, including tellers, besides pairs, against a majority of 354, or about twenty per cent. more in proportion, in a larger House, than the minority obtained by Mr. Fox.

Lord North, afterwards Lord Guildford, who spoke in the debate, was entirely opposed to a rupture with our ally Russia about Oczakow.

Mr. Fox in the debate said: "I cannot conceive any case in

which a great and wise nation having committed itself by a menace can withdraw that menace without disgrace. The converse of the proposition I can easily conceive—that there may be a demand, for instance, not fit to be made at all, but which being made, and with a menace, it is fit to insist upon. This undoubtedly goes to make a nation, like an individual, cautious of committing itself, because there is no ground so tender as that of honour. How do Ministers think on this subject? Oczakow was everything by itself, but when they added to Oczakow the honour of England it became nothing. Oczakow by itself threatened the balance of Europe. Oczakow and honour weighed nothing in the scale. Honour is in their political arithmetic a minus quantity to be subtracted from the value of Oczakow."

This unanswerable argument of Mr. Fox's would alone afford a justification for Russia in now going to war with Turkey, for the circumstances of the case, as I have shown, compelled her to menace Turkey, and she could not recede with honour; whereas England, after sending the bold September despatch, put its tail between its legs, and ignominiously retreated when Turkey resisted. Guarantees for the benefit of the Christians were all important, but when the honour of England was added they became unnecessary.

In the debate on 1st February, 1828, Sir James Mackintosh, the celebrated historian, said, "It was bare justice to Russia to say that her dealings with the Ottoman Power for the last seven years had been marked with as great forbearance as the conduct of that power (Turkey) had been distinguished by continued insolence and incorrigible contumacy." And Lord Holland said, in the same debate, "Russia, too, was our ancient ally. . . . In 1770, our allies, the Russians, sent a great fleet into the Mediterranean for the purpose of overpowering the Turks. What was the policy of this country? To assist the Russian navy. That fleet was re-fitted in our harbours, and with the munitions and implements which it received from us, burnt a Turkish town and fleet, and continued cruising in the Archipelago for no less than five or six years."

In the debate on July 16th, 1828, Lord Aberdeen said, "His Imperial Majesty (the Czar) at once divested himself of the character of a belligerent in the Mediterranean, and *no one would deny that the sincerity and the generosity the Emperor of Russia had displayed in doing this were entitled to the highest praise.*" According to Bulwer's "Life of Palmerston" (p. 283), "When the Crimean War was under consideration, Lord Aberdeen was accused of being over-Russian."

In the same debate, Lord Holland said, "Russia, which had for a long period out of deference to their feelings foregone the fair object of all her ambition—which, with an attention to the general policy of Europe, and a magnanimity unparalleled, had long resisted the strongest temptations, had attended only to the representations of this country and her allies, and had waited faithfully to the last moment before she had taken any open measures to oppose the insults of Turkey—had resisted the disposition of her people to engage in war. Russia had now engaged in war which, upon all principles of policy and public law, she had a right to wage—nay, was called on by her duty to wage. . . . "

Lord Palmerston said, "In that war (1829), my opinion is that the Turks were the aggressors. . . . They seized Russian ships and cargoes, expelled Russian subjects from Turkey, and shut the Bosphorus against Russian commerce, all in violation of treaties, and declared their intention of not fulfilling the treaty of Akerman; and all this upon no other pretence than certain things which Russia had done in conjunction with her allies, England and France, to prevail upon Turkey to accede to some arrangement about Greece. . . . I heartily wish her (Russia) success (in the war against Turkey) *as the only chance* of making a good settlement of the Greek state. . . . It should have been distinctly explained to Turkey that the people of England would be little disposed to pay for the recovery of unpronounceable fortresses on the Danube, after they had been lost by the obstinate perverseness of Turkey," and he anticipated and evidently rejoiced that the least likely result of the war with Russia "is that it should replace Turkey in the

state of territorial occupation in which she stood before the war commenced," therefore he was then of opinion that we should not go to war for the integrity of Turkey.

Sir H. Bulwer says, "That which will appear extraordinary to many who knew Lord Palmerston in after years as the most staunch protector of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and the most resolute opponent of Russian ambition, is the fervour with which at this time he advocated the interests of Greece, and the indifference with which he seemed to regard the advance of a Russian army towards Constantinople."

In 1829, Lord Carnarvon said, "Let us consider that the Greek religion existed throughout the Russian dominions, and if Turkey should wage war against that religion, was it in the nature of man that the Russians should remain calm spectators of the destruction—he had almost said annihilation—of the Greeks? I feel rather surprised at their long forbearance."

In the debate of July 11th, 1833, Lord Palmerston said, "I have great doubts that any intention to partition that empire at all entered into the policy of the Russian government; besides, I very much doubt also whether the Russian nation properly so called would be prepared to see that transference of power of residence and authority to the southern provinces, which would be the necessary consequence of the conquest by Russia of Constantinople," and, he added, "*if we have quietly beheld the temporary occupation of the Turkish capital by the forces of Russia*, it is because we have full confidence in the honour and good faith of Russia, and believe that those troops will be withdrawn in a very short time." At that time we had not even an Ambassador at Constantinople.

It seems strange that, when Russia was actually in Constantinople, Lord Palmerston should have had confidence in her honour; but that when she had been thus tried and not found wanting, he would never afterwards trust her, merely because, after saving Turkey from inevitable ruin, she stipulated, by a *secret* article in the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, that her men of war should be allowed to pass the Dardanelles, the highway of waters to which

she has a natural and indefeasible right as much as to pass through the Sound (we having joined her and France in a *secret* article in 1826).

Lord Palmerston, on the 20th Dec., 1838, said, "Her Majesty's Government accept as entirely satisfactory the declaration of the Russian Government that it does not harbour any designs hostile to the interests of Great Britain in India."

The Affghan war was waged to deprive a wise, able, and friendly sovereign of his throne, Dost Mahomed, and to supplant him by a tool of ours, Shah Soojah, who had been driven from the Government by his subjects ten years before, costing £20,000,000 and the lives of 20,000 men.

As Lord Palmerston was the originator of the Russian scare, and of the lamentable and unjustifiable Crimean War, I will now quote from the debate in the House of Commons in March, 1861, on Mr. Dunlop's motion to show that he was roundly accused, by Mr. Bright and others, of garbling, mutilating, and forging the despatches of Sir A. Burnes, in order to involve us in the disastrous and humiliating Affghan war; and on that occasion, although Mr. Disraeli supported him in burking an inquiry, the chiefs of both parties in the House of Commons could only get 161 members, including tellers, to support Lord Palmerston in the division, in which his whole character was at stake, or less than one in four of the whole House. Anything more disgraceful than the Affghan war, and than the garbling of Sir A. Burnes' despatches, never occurred in the history of England, and therefore the weight of Lord Palmerston's opinion against Russia in later life, which is totally at variance with his earlier opinions, is very materially lessened, if not destroyed.

Mr. Dunlop said the despatches of Sir Alexander Burnes were mutilated, and whole paragraphs left out, in order to make them appear favourable to the Affghan war, of which he never approved, and the war was undertaken from fear of Russia.

Mr. Kaye and Sir Herbert Edwardes said of the Affghan war that it was an "unhallowed, unrighteous, and causeless war."

Mr. Bright said, "He (Lord Palmerston) knows there have been

garbling, mutilation, practically and essentially falsehood and forgery in these despatches. Once more I ask the noble Lord to tell us who did it. Was it his own right hand, or was it Lord Broughton's right hand?"

I will now recall a few incidents of our relations with Russia. In 1553 the Anglo-Russian Company was established; in 1597 the Czar Ivan solicited the hand of Queen Elizabeth; in 1697 Peter the Great visited England, for which he had the highest esteem and regard; and in 1800 we had Russian troops in Guernsey, guarding that island for us against Napoleon.

In 1801 we churlishly refused to exchange some Russian soldiers who had been taken prisoners whilst in our pay, against an equal number of Frenchmen in our prisons, to the just indignation of Russia, and Napoleon then wisely not only released them, but supplied them with every necessary.

In 1812 the Russians performed the heroic act of burning Moscow, and by thus destroying the Grand Army, saved Europe from the domination of the French. I should like to ask, if we were invaded by the French or Germans, if our nobility and gentry would be found setting fire to their houses in Eaton and Belgrave Squares, and whether they would not rather counsel submission?

After Navarino, while the English Parliament rejected the motion for a vote of thanks to Admiral Codrington and the fleet, for the glorious victory of Navarino, the Czar sent him the Order of St. George, and offered, if there was no English ship at the moment adapted to his command, to let him hoist his flag on board a Russian ship of the line; and Count Nesselrode added:—"You will place at his disposal all those composing our squadron, and assure him that the Emperor would consider his presence on board one of our vessels as a distinguished honour conferred on the Russian navy."

In 1828 it is stated in the King's speech that, though Russia had blockaded the Dardanelles, she had generously exempted from its operation those operations of Englishmen "which were undertaken upon the faith of His Majesty's declaration to his

Parliament respecting the neutrality of the Mediterranean sea."

During the campaign of Paskiewitch in Asia Minor in 1828, the Russians conducted themselves with the utmost humanity, never allowing the captured cities to be pillaged, nor retaliating the atrocities of the Turks.

When Hadgi Pasha, after the storming of the entrenched camp at Milli Duz in 1829, surrendered with his whole suite, so impressed was he with the noble conduct of Paskiewitch and the Russians, that he said to his conqueror, "The fate of arms is inconstant. A few hours ago I commanded an army of 20,000 men; now, to my shame, I am your prisoner; but your name is revered among us because of your great qualities; and it is said if you know how to conquer you know also how to forgive. I trust myself to your magnanimity."

Paskiewitch showed himself not unworthy of the appeal. He treated him with distinction, and assured him of the protection of the Emperor. The consequence of this generous policy was that Paskiewitch was able to organize several corps of Mahometan cavalry out of the nomad tribes of the provinces he had subdued; and the Pasha of Mush, who had furnished 12,000 irregular cavalry to the Porte—although the Sultan had in the meantime joined one of his armies with the so-called sacred standard—put his forces at the disposal of the Russian general, and these Mahometan regiments were perfectly steady to the Russian colours; so that not only non-Ottoman Mahometans will fight against the Sultan on behalf of Russian infidels, even when the holy standard is displayed, but even Mahometan Turks will do so on being duly paid.

In 1830 the Russians, with quixotic liberality, relaxed the conditions of the Treaty of Adrianople, and gave up a considerable portion of the war indemnity stipulated to be paid by Turkey.

In my letters to the *Scotsman*, I have quoted Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Schuyler, Mr. Maghan, and the Chinese Envoy as to the excellent conduct of the Russians in the Khivan campaign, and I will not, therefore, again refer to it; and I have mentioned what

is to be said in extenuation of their severities in Poland in a separate chapter under that heading.

With respect to the conduct of the Russians towards the Circassians, a people whose conduct in Turkey is so abominable that the Conference stipulated that no more colonists of that country should be allowed to enter European Turkey, and that as many as possible of those residing in Turkey should be sent back to Asia, Mr. Douglas Freshfield, the well-known traveller, states in the *Times* :—

"An acquaintance of their chief (of the Lesghians) described him to Adam Oleasius, Ambassador to Persia in 1638, in this somewhat unflattering language :—'He did not care for God or the devil, or any foreign prince ; that he played with his word ; that he was one of the most notorious brigands of his country ; that his greatest amusement was to rob and to shed blood.'

"As Mr. Wallace has shown, Mahometans can live very happily and quietly under Russian rule. In the Caucasus, religion is by no means the test of loyalty to Russia. Toleration, except to dissenters, is a tradition of Russian policy. The disaffected tribes fight, when they do fight, for principles much more simple ; and the taking away of the right of robbery is in their eyes far the most grievous of the incidents of the rule they rise against. The Karatchai, also a Tcherkess race, at one time gave trouble, but in the last revolt took the Russian side.

"Klaproth said, in 1835, 'They have generally adopted a very defective system of conduct towards the people of the mountains (the Circassians) ; they employ gentleness and humanity, means which will not succeed, as they regard them as marks of feebleness and fear.' Whatever popular belief may hold, Schamyl was no more a Circassian than Wallace a Welshman. To overthrow Russian rule in the Caucasus would be to take away from the lowlanders a government which has (I quote a hostile witness, Mr. L. Oliphant) 'been efficacious in improving their material condition and in developing the internal resources of the country,' and to restore to the highlanders their immemorial privileges of arson, rape, and murder. These noble results were within narrow limits

achieved by Omar Pasha. The babble of those who now regret that he was not more successful is only interesting as a proof of what crimes the principle of self-interest, irrespective of right or wrong, in politics may lead to."

In 1854, during the Crimean war, Russia faithfully paid every farthing of the interest of her debt, whilst she might very fairly have paid the interest of that portion which was not shown to be the property of her subjects, or of neutrals, into the bank of a neutral power as a deposit, that it might not be used against her in the war; and the consequence of Russian honesty is that their Three per Cents. are above 50, or higher than the English Three per Cents. at one period of the war with France, whilst the Turkish Six per Cents. of 1869, in consequence of their fraudulent bankruptcy, are at about 8. Then it was said that Russia had an eye to India, but if that were so, why did she not send money and adventurers to India to injure us during the Mutiny, or to China when we were simultaneously at war with that country? I maintain that Russia acted in the most honourable and friendly manner towards us at those junctures. There is another thing—what did Russia do at Tilsit? Why, she insisted on the restoration of half his dominions to the King of Prussia. Then in the year 1875 Russia alone prevented Germany from renewing the war with France which she had intended to commence; and another point was that in the Crimean War, the English prisoners were treated, not only with humanity, but with great kindness by the Russians. Lieutenant Royer, speaking on this subject, said "the English prisoners were well cared for. They were told to ask for everything they might require, and that they should have it for the asking."

One of the officers declares that if they had been wrecked on the coast of England they could not have received greater attention than was lavished upon them. To such an extent was this carried that the English officers were not allowed to burn tallow, but were supplied with wax candles. The conditions of Mouravieff at the surrender of Kars, in 1855, were marked by chivalrous courtesy to his unfortunate foes. On the surrender, he gave a

banquet to the whole Turkish garrison, and General Williams was treated with the utmost consideration during the time he was a prisoner of war in Russia. Above all, the Czar nobly emancipated upwards of twenty-three millions of serfs at a cost of about £120,000,000, which is an infinitely grander achievement than our emancipation of the West India negroes at a cost of £20,000,000.

I may further add, that the Americans have the greatest regard and esteem for the Russians, and not a single American would degrade himself by fighting with Turkey against Russia and the oppressed Christians, though Englishmen can be got to do this discreditable work; and the American newspapers, of all shades of politics, strongly urge us not to go to war with Russia in favour of Turkey. Indeed, *Harper's Illustrated Journal*, of New York, has several amusing caricatures, with the British lion or John Bull, of colossal proportions, and the advice, "Don't make a fool of yourself again, John, as you did in the Crimean War."

Freeman says, "Constantinople cannot be ruled from St. Petersburg, neither can St. Petersburg be ruled from Constantinople. The Romanoff may reign in New Rome, the Russian cannot, for the Romanoff on the throne of New Rome would cease to be Russian. . . . We have faith in nations, and we see in the great uprising of the Russian nation on behalf of its oppressed brethren one of the noblest movements of generous sympathy that the world ever saw."

Lord Beaconsfield, one of the most inveterate opponents of Russia, said on 5th May, 1876 :—"I think that from the period of the conquest of Tashkend every one must have felt that it was almost inevitable that all the Khanates would be conquered by Russia. . . . This event, after all, is one which was anticipated, and in a direction of country that is not peculiarly menacing to those Imperial interests which engage our attention. . . . My hon. friend quotes the opinion of gentlemen who think that the advance of Russia into Central Asia ought to be nipped in the bud. Now, nipping in the bud means that the English Power should have proceeded beyond our English boundary . . . and

we should have entered on one of the most hazardous, and, I should say, unwise struggles that could well be conceived. . . . The idea that Great Britain and Russia agreed to establish a neutral zone between their respective Empires, and that Russia has at this time systematically violated the neutral zone that was agreed upon, is one of those delusions which, having once got possession of the public mind, it is very difficult to eradicate. The fact is, that no neutral zone has been agreed upon by the statesmen of the different Powers. With regard to understanding, *there was an understanding about Khiva, but we must all admit that was a most unfortunate understanding, because no two persons are agreed as to what that understanding was* . . . . I am not of that school who view the advance of Russia into Asia with those misgivings which some do. I think that Asia is large enough for the destinies of Russia and England. . . . *Far from looking forward with alarm to the development of Russia in Central Asia, I see no reason why they should not conquer Tartary any more than why England should not have conquered India.*" The Turkophile press pretend that the Russians have annexed Khiva, but I have the highest possible authority for stating that the Khan reigns in Khiva, and is quite independent of Russia.

Another illustration of the respect and regard which is felt among the most distant populations for Russia, is furnished by the fact that, in 1876, Russia arranged with Japan to cede the Kurile Islands for the southern part of Saghalien. The Japanese, on leaving the latter island, took with them 625 Aïnes who had expressed a desire to remain subjects of Japan, but the great majority of the population chose the Russian nationality. Upon the other hand, only 72 inhabitants of the Kurile Islands elected the Japanese nationality, and the others have all emigrated into Russian territory. . . . This shows that, relatively to the population, more of the people of the Kurile Islands were willing to expatriate themselves, from regard for Russia, than there were of the people of Alsace and Lorraine who were ready to abandon their homes out of love for France.

During the present war, the *Times* correspondent at Constanti-

nople has recently written to say that the people of Armenia are anxious to get rid of the Turkish domination and to become Russian subjects; and the good feeling of the Croatians to Russia is clearly manifested by what occurred when the Archduke Albert visited Agram the other day. The *Times* says:—"The town was decorated by day and illuminated by night; addresses were presented; a patriotic song of combative character was sung; the statue of Jellachich was crowned; and, most significant of all, the Russian Hymn was played persistently. The meaning of all this was that Agram wished to make a pro-Slavonic and anti-Magyar demonstration. The inhabitants had been greatly scandalized that the Hungarians should compliment the Sultan and fraternize with Softas, and they therefore desired to make it known that their own sympathies were with their oppressed brethren, and not with the Mahometan tyrant.". The Czechs of Bohemia are also enthusiastic for the Christians, and for Russia; and it should be borne in mind that, while there are only 5,680,000 of these domineering Magyars, who were formerly serfs of the Turks, there are no less than 17,000,000 of Slavonians in Austria, who, in case Austria attacked Russia, might very probably rise in arms on the other side and put down the Magyars once for all. I may add that, as the Magyars when they were Turkish slaves were emancipated by the swords of the Slavonians, it is most ungrateful on their part to sympathize with the barbarous Turk instead of with their former fellow-serfs, the Christians of Turkey.

Dr. Rieger, the leader of the Panslavists in Bohemia, writes thus to the Moscow Slavonic Committee:—"To its shame be it said, Europe has become so unchristian that the descendants of those who of old took part in the Crusades undertook an expedition for the Crescent in the Crimea, in order to support the further oppression of the Christians, and the domination of that race whose power has always been fatal to civilization. Let, therefore, that youth, the great Russian people, take up the sword of humanitarianism and Christianity, which other nations cannot take up on account of their passion for gain or narrow-hearted egotism and weakness. . . . . .

How is it possible that the Bohemian people should not desire from the bottom of its heart the complete success of the Russian arms? Do not the Russians go to battle for right, freedom, religion, for humanitarianism, for the honour of families which have been long enough insulted on the soil of Christian Europe? The glory of the Russians in that struggle is our glory, and it raises the pride of all Slavonians, and their self-consciousness that the blood of our brethren will be shed for our brethren. We cannot but rejoice when the powerful Slav, by defending the weak Slavs, has earned a right to the gratitude and love of the whole Slavonic family."

The Germans of Austria used to tyranise over all the other nationalities in their dominions, and they were not ashamed to call on the Russians (whom they now ungratefully abuse) in 1849 to save the Austrian Empire from ruin, by putting down the Hungarian insurrection. Now that the Germans have been compelled to give free institutions to the Hungarians, both Germans and Hungarians wish to keep down the natural political aspirations of the Slavonians, and other still oppressed nationalities; and the "cynical Germans," careless of justice, vainly hope to control Eastern Europe by means of the Magyars.

Kinglake informs us that "there is ground for believing that Louis Napoleon made early overtures to the Czar (after the *coup d'état*), for what we may call a predatory alliance," and that the rebuff then inflicted upon him by the Emperor Nicholas preceded his determination to seek a close alliance with England; so that probably the Czar might have had a large portion of Turkey if he had consented to betray England at the instigation of Napoleon And he adds, "Perhaps a full knowledge of the truth would justify the belief that, from the Peace of Adrianople down to the time of his death, the Czar would have preferred the ascendancy which Sir Stratford Canning enjoyed at Constantinople to any scheme of conquest; and what is more, if Nicholas had succeeded in gaining this ascendancy, he would have been inclined to use it as a means of enforcing counsels somewhat similar to those which were pressed on the Sultan by the English ambassador." In the

eleven weeks of the Mentschikoff mission, "the Emperor Nicholas destroyed *the whole repute which he had earned for more than quarter of a century by wielding the power of Russia with justice and moderation towards foreign states;*" and that "It would be wrong to believe that, after the middle of March, 1853, Russia was acting in furtherance of any scheme of territorial aggrandisement, for it is plain that by that time the Czar's vague ambition had dwindled down into a mere wish to wring from the Porte a protectorate of the Greek Church in Turkey."

With reference to the Indian scare, Lord Salisbury remarked on June 12th, in answer to a statement of Lord De Mauley, that the policy of Russia had been to deprive England of India ever since the time of Peter the Great, "The policy which he imputes to her (Russia) could hardly have been initiated by Peter the Great, because he died in 1725, and the Empire of British India was not established till 1757.

We make a great outcry about the balance of power, which Mr. Lowe has shown to be a mischievous fiction, for how can three or more powers or weights be balanced against each other? and how are the respective values of men and of money, of land and of naval forces, &c., to be appraised?

The British empire contains a population of about 240 millions. Russia has only 86 millions, so that about 80 millions of the population of our dependencies would have to be taken from the British empire and annexed to Russia, to establish even a numerical balance of power between us; and our national debts, fleet, commerce, and national wealth would have to be treated in a similar manner. Even if the whole empire of Turkey were added to Russia, she would still be inferior, even in population, to the British empire; yet we are told by a veracious press that the annexation of a single province of Turkey, say, the Principalities which we ourselves demanded for Russia in 1806, when we forced the Dardanelles, would destroy the balance of power, and endanger our Indian Empire.

Carlyle justly says, "The newspaper outcry against Russia is no more respectable to me than the howlings of Bedlam, proceed-

ing as it does from the deepest ignorance, egoism, and paltry national jealousy;" and that the public may see that Russia is not the only power which is denounced by foreigners as aggressive and unscrupulous, I subjoin the following extract from a leading French newspaper, written some years ago :—

"Are there any other seas, any other continents, seek an inhabited or uninhabited spot where she [England] has not planted her flag? All lands newly discovered she unhesitatingly annexes to herself. When will this insolent usurpation cease? What balance can exist in the world in face of this ambition, which increases with conquest, and becomes extravagant by dint of impunity? It is not one nation, but every nation which should open their eyes. It is essential not for one people, but for every people, to know whether the ocean is free, and if the universe is to fall back in presence of the shopkeeping Cæsars, who avail themselves of the disunion of states to turn them all to account, and to aggrandise themselves on their common ruin."

Heine said, "Never again will I visit that detestable land (England), where all the men are like machines, and all the machines like men. The din and the silence there are alike desolating. When I was introduced to the Governor of Heligoland, and this stick of an Englishman stood motionless before me, without speaking a word, for several minutes, involuntarily the idea came into my head to look at him from behind to see if somebody had forgotten to wind him up. My heart sinks within me when I think that after all Shakespeare was an Englishman, and belongs to the most repulsive people that God in His anger ever created."*

Montalembert says :—"In the first place, England does not practice the belief in logic. She has reserved to herself from all time the unlimited use of the most striking inconsistency."

Thackeray speaks thus of the British snob in his relation to foreigners: "I think in my heart that the British snob, for conceit and self-sufficiency and braggartism, in his way is without

* This is not quite in accordance with the saying, "*Non Angli sed Angeli.*"

a parallel. . . . Oh, my country, if I were a Frenchman, how I should hate you! That brutal, ignorant, peevish, bully of an Englishman is showing himself in every city of Europe. One of the dullest creatures under heaven, he goes trampling Europe under foot, shouldering his way into galleries and cathedrals, and bustling into palaces with his buckram uniform. At church or theatre, gala or picture-gallery, *his* face never varies. A thousand delightful sights pass before his bloodshot eyes and don't affect him. Countless brilliant scenes of life and manners are shown him, but never move him. He goes to church and calls the practices there degrading and superstitious, as if *his* altar was the only one that was acceptable. He goes to picture-galleries, and is more ignorant about art than a French shoeblack. Art and nature pass, and there is no dot of admiration in his stupid eyes. Nothing moves him except when a very great man comes his way, and then the rigid, proud, self-confident, inflexible British snob can be as humble as a flunkey and as supple as a harlequin."

De Tocqueville speaks thus of the typical Englishman: "The Englishman enjoys tranquilly the real and imaginary advantages that his country possesses in his estimation. If he concedes nothing to foreign countries, neither does he demand anything for his own. The blame of foreigners does not move him, and their praise does not flatter him in the least. He holds himself towards the world in a reserve full of disdain and ignorance; his pride requires no aliment—it lives upon itself."

The Russians are accused of stirring up the oppressed Christians of Turkey to revolt, and this is said by the Philo-Turks to be diabolical conduct; but it is not diabolical for the Turks to send emissaries to incite the Circassians to revolt, and I may add a portion of the Circassians have revolted, solely because the Russians prevent them selling their women and children as slaves at Constantinople.

As to the outcry against Russia for its annexations, it seems to be forgotten that Lithuania was no part of ancient Poland, but was annexed by the Poles; that Finland belonged originally to Russia, and was ceded to Sweden in 1617; so that Russia, in taking

possession of these provinces, only regained its own territory, whilst Georgia was voluntarily ceded by its ruler to Russia.

One way in which we have shown our neutrality is by the English Ambassador in Persia urging the Shah to be reconciled to the Sultan, and not to ally himself with Russia.

There are few subjects on which Englishmen are so contentedly ignorant as the past history and present condition of the Russian Empire, and the Russophobist party will not even read or listen to a single word in its favour, but hug with avidity their favourite prejudices against that great country.

It is a total mistake to suppose that Russia is entirely devoid of free institutions; and at this moment the whole of Poland would have been in the enjoyment of a freer constitution than she had ever enjoyed before, if it had not been for the unfortunate and unwise rebellions in that country. Courland has various privileges and immunities; the Grand Duchy of Finland, which was finally restored to Russia in 1809, possesses still a national parliament, consisting of four estates, the nobles, the clergy, the burghers, and the peasants; the Emperor Alexander I., who was termed a republican monarch, openly pledged himself to give as liberal a constitution to the whole Russian Empire as any country in the whole world possessed, and was only prevented by his premature death; and there is every reason to hope and to believe that the present benevolent and patriotic Emperor, who has, so to speak, swallowed the camel of serf emancipation, will not strain at the gnat of giving a free constitution to his country. The following were the very words of the Czar Alexander I., on the opening of the Polish Diet, on the 27th March, 1818; and the earnestness and perfect sincerity with which he expressed his benevolent and patriotic intentions is quite equal to what the most ardent Liberal would reasonably desire. Having expatiated on the advantage of a constitutional *régime*, he added:—"With the assistance of God, I hope to extend its salutary influence to all the countries entrusted to my care—prove to the contemporary kings that liberal institutions, which they pretend to confound with the disastrous doctrines which in these days threaten the

social system with a frightful catastrophe, are not a dangerous illusion, but that, reduced in good faith to practice, and directed in a pure spirit towards Conservative ends and the good of humanity, they are perfectly allied to order, and the best security for the happiness of nations."

Even at present there is a Council of the Empire, consisting of about sixty members, which was established in 1810; and also a directing Senate, which was created so far back as 1711, divided into eight committees. The Czar appoints to all ecclesiastical offices, but so does the Sovereign of England appoint bishops and other dignitaries; but the Czar does not decide matters of doctrine, and is head of the Church like the Queen of England, but in no greater degree.

The points in which the Greco-Russian Church differs from the Roman Catholic faith are its denying the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, its prohibiting the celibacy of the clergy, and its authorising all individuals to read and study the Scriptures in the vernacular; and surely on all these points we agree much more nearly with the Greek than with the Roman Catholic Church. Though English Protestants do not think that the marriage of clergymen should be obligatory, they certainly think such a regulation infinitely to be preferred to enforced celibacy. We equally deny the supremacy of the Pope, and we cordially approve of the permission to all individuals to read the Bible in the vernacular. It should be borne in mind that the Greek Church separated from the Latin Church, not in consequence of differences of doctrine, but because Pope Gregory II. excommunicated the Emperor Leo in 729, and five years afterwards the Greek Church condemned the worship of images, which is still retained by the Latins. In 1274, at the Council of Lyons, the Greek and Latin Churches were re-united, but again separated three years later. So far back as 1723, a union was proposed between the Church of England and the Greek Church, and the project has since been repeatedly renewed, so that any strictures on the Greek faith come with a very ill grace from us.

There are several branches of the Greek Church, such as the

Bulgarian and the Russian, who have different and independent heads or Patriarchs, yet they do not consider each other heterodox, as Roman Catholics would.

With reference to education in Russia, in the Budget of 1876 no less a sum than £2,059,506 was set apart for this purpose; whilst, before the recent Education Act for England, in 1868, our expenditure on education in England was only £781,329. In other words, Russia, in proportion to population, laid out about two-thirds as much per head in 1876 as we did in 1868.

The total foreign loans of Russia are only £135,370,000, whilst in Turkey they are £184,981,783: that is to say, the debt of Turkey for a population of 21,648,500, who have to pay the interest on the loans, exclusive of the small amount of the tributes, is nearly £9 per head; whilst in Russia it is only about £1 12s. per head, and in England £23 6s. 8d. per head.

The total length of railways in Russia is 11,576 miles, and of telegraphs 31,459 miles.

Mr. Holms tells us that in 1865 our exports to Russia were £2,923,000, and in 1875 £8,059,000, showing an increase in ten years only of 175 per cent.; whilst our exports to Turkey in 1865 were £5,673,000, and in 1875 £5,897,000, an increase of less than 4 per cent. The number of vessels cleared between Great Britain and Russia in 1875 were 7,360, with 2,843,766 tonnage, against 835 between Great Britain and Turkey, with only 550,448 tonnage.

The whole country is divided into Mirs or Communes; these again are united into Voloste or districts, with a population of about 2,000, each of which is presided over by an elder or starchine, who, in case the district consists of several villages, has above him a starosta.

The *Times* states:—"The most radical vote passed by the French Chamber was that which made the votes of the Municipal Councils public. Harmless as such an arrangement may seem to English people, it might be unwise in France. Such, at least, was the belief of so staunch a Republican as M. Jules Simon."

In Russia the discussions of the provincial and village as-

semblies are public, so that Russia in that respect has more liberty and better government than France.

It should be noted also that Russia has given notice that she intends to abide by the Declaration of Paris restricting maritime rights, not only towards those who signed it, but also towards Spain and the United States.

In Russia, too, the punishment of death is abolished, whilst only the other night in the House of Commons a large majority refused even to inquire by a Commission whether the law of homicide could be amended, chiefly in the direction of taking unpremeditated murder out of the category of capital crime, and leaving premeditated murder punishable with death.

The donations of the Russians to the Christian cause, and to the support of the Russian volunteers amounted to about the magnificent sum of £400,000, much more in proportion to the resources of Russia than we subscribed to the Patriotic Fund.

I have shown, on the evidence of Mr. Wallace and others,* that Russia possesses provincial institutions freer and more democratic than those of England; that the peasantry generally possess land, whilst only a small minority own land in England; and that they are evidently better fitted to receive Parliamentary franchise than our own agricultural labourers, to whom we persistently and unjustly refuse it. The Russian nobility have none of that aristocratic hauteur and exclusiveness, and almost as odius condescension, which characterises a great portion of our English aristocracy, and altogether one is inclined to believe that the standard of happiness among the masses is quite equal to that of our own country, and that in many respects we have much to learn from that Russia which so many ignorant Englishmen look down upon with such unjust and ineffable disdain.

Middle-aged "west-enders" will recollect in their early youth that the prevalent idea of a Russian in those days was that of a man whose favourite food was tallow candles, tainted oysters, and train oil; but we have now learned to know them better, and have discovered that it was we, and not they, who were the real social

* Which will be found in the appendix.

barbarians. At that time we used to load our dinner-table with a profusion of food of every description, interspersed with heavy and tasteless family plate. The wretched master of the house at a large dinner party was nothing better than principal carver, a task task which he generally performed with the utmost awkwardness, the perspiration on a hot summer's day streaming down his face in torrents as he vainly endeavoured to sever a joint, while the perfume from the heterogeneous meats and vegetables formed an odour which certainly did not come from Araby the Blest.

It is to Russian good taste alone that we owe the present civilised system of dining "*à la* Russe," with nothing on the table but beautiful flowers and exquisite fruit served on Bohemian glass or china, mingled with elegant and tasteful silver epergnes; and the merits of a Charlotte Russe glacèe, and of the delicious caviare, which is peculiar to Russia, have at last dawned upon our torpid conceptions, while the delicate Russian cigarette of perfumed tobacco has to a great extent supplanted the coarse weed from slaveholding Havannah, and the perfumed Russian leather is also unrivalled in the world. The Russians, too, are noted all over Europe for the ease, facility, and perfect accent with which they pronounce various languages, and especially French, which they speak so idiomatically that our neighbours over the silver streak cannot pay any foreigner a greater compliment than "Qu'il parle Français comme un Russe," whilst you might almost count on your fingers all the Englishmen who speak French to the same perfection.

The following satirical fragment from Thackeray, about unreasonable prejudice, as illustrated by quarrelling with a man for eating peas with a knife, is extremely applicable to the prejudice against Russia and the Russians entertained at the "west-end." "I once knew a man who, dining in my company at the Europe coffee-house at Naples, ate peas with the assistance of his knife. He was a person with whose society I was greatly pleased at first indeed—we had met in the crater of Mount Vesuvius, and were subsequently robbed and held to ransom in Calabria—a man of great powers, excellent heart, and varied information, but I had never before seen him with a dish of peas, and his conduct

in regard to them caused me the deepest pain. After having seen him thus publicly comport himself, but one course was open to me—to cut his acquaintance. . . Everybody at Naples remarked the separation of Damon and Pythias; indeed, Marrowfat had saved my life more than once, but what was I to do? . . We met at Sir George Golloper's after four years. . . What was my astonishment, what my delight, when I saw him use his fork like any other Christian. Old times rushed back upon me; his rescuing me from the brigands; his gallant conduct in the affair with the Countess Degli Spinachi; his lending me £1,700. I almost burst into tears with joy; my voice trembled with emotion. 'George, my boy,' I exclaimed; 'George Marrowfat, my dear fellow, a glass of wine!' We have been the closest friends ever since." And so, when England and Russia fully understand each other, they will be the best of allies.

I may add that the war we undertook against the Affghans, which led to a severe repulse with the loss of 20,000 men, the Crimean War, and the war which the "west-end" wishes us now to undertake in defence of alleged British interests, which never have been, and never will be, really attacked, remind me of the course pursued by the frogs, in the Irish song about St. Patrick, who all committed suicide to save themselves from slaughter; and of the conduct of the Greeks who captured Troy after a twenty years' siege, on the supposition that Helen had been carried off by Paris, and was held in captivity in the city, whilst it appears, as any one can see in *Lemprière's Classical Dictionary*, that Menelaus, on visiting Egypt after the capture of Troy, found Helen then at the Court of Proteus, as Priam had vainly assured him, and was convinced too late that the Trojan war had been undertaken on unjust and unpardonable grounds.

France, after being hopelessly beaten in an aggressive and unprovoked war, by a nation inferior in numbers and wealth to herself, has never ceased, even after the lapse of six years, from sulking, abusing, and maligning the Germans; but Russia, with a population of 86,000,000, after an heroic defence in an aggressive war, wrongfully waged against her, in which she contended bravely

with the English, French, Sardinians, and Turks, with a population, including their dependencies, of about 326,000,000, or nearly four to one, has nobly and truly declared, "La Russie ne boude pas elle se recueille." (Russia does not sulk, she restores herself.)

Those who are unacquainted with Russia are very apt to speak with considerable severity of the Czars, as if they were always tyrants, but the truth is, that the rulers of that great country have usually been individuals of remarkable ability, and the last three, including the present sovereign, would have done honour to any age or country.

I have related in the chapter headed, "Poland from a common sense point of view," how beneficent and successful the Emperor Alexander I. was in the government of Poland, and that he fully intended to establish a liberal constitutional government throughout the Russian Empire, and there is no doubt that he was always received with the utmost enthusiasm, both in Poland and the other parts of the Empire. Alison tells us, "The Empress Elizabeth, too, was in the highest degree amiable and exemplary, self-denying, generous, and affectionate. The mind of Alexander, however, was naturally inclined to deep and mystical religious emotions, and he had been much affected by the dreadful scenes which he had witnessed at the inundation of St. Petersburg. During a temporary estrangement from the Empress he became a hermit in his palace, and sought a temporary respite to his anxiety in frequenting the houses of some highly respectable families in middle life, for the most part Germans, to whom his rank was known, but where he insisted upon being treated as an ordinary guest. There he often expressed his envy at the happiness which reigned in those domestic circumstances, and sighed to think that the Emperor of all the Russias was compelled to seek at the hearths of others that felicity which his grandeur or his faults had denied him at his own. . . . Shortly afterwards he again sought the society of the Empress, who had returned to St. Petersburg, was attentive to her smallest wishes, and sought to efface the recollection of former neglect by every kindness which affection could suggest."

The health of the Empress requiring a change to the Crimea, "though his own health was broken, as he had not recovered from an attack of erysipelas, he resolved upon running the risk of the journey . . . but he had a presentiment that this journey would be his last, and that he was about to expire beside the Empress . . . and on this occasion he directed the metropolitan bishop in secret to have the service for the dead chanted for him when he returned on the following morning at four o'clock." On his death-bed, "causing the windows to be opened, he said, looking at the blue vault, 'What a beautiful day!' and feeling the arms of the Empress around him, he said tenderly, 'My love, you must be very fatigued.' These were his last words." During the whole journey of the remains from the Crimea to St. Petersburg, "every night when the procession rested, crowds of people from a great distance around flocked to the spot to kneel down and kiss the bier where their beloved Czar was laid," and at the funeral "the old grenadiers, his comrades in the campaigns in Germany and France, wept like children. . . . Had Alexander died shortly after the first capture of Paris in 1814, he would have left a name unique in the history of the world, for never before had so great a part been so nobly played on such a theatre. It is hard to say whether his fortitude in adversity, his resolution in danger, or his clemency in victory, were the most admirable."

The Emperor Nicholas, again, repeatedly refused to accept his elder brother Constantine's voluntary abdication of the throne, and the interregnum continued three weeks, during which the two brothers—a thing unheard of—were mutually declining and urging the Empire on the other. Much has been said by those who are ignorant of the facts of the severity with which the Emperor Nicholas suppressed the revolt which occurred at his accession, but the fact is that only five suffered death, and only thirty-one were exiled to Siberia, which is nothing to the severity exercised by the English Government after the suppression of the rebellion in 1745, and till these executions there had not been one for eighty years previously at St. Petersburg. The Emperor

Nicholas behaved most generously to the wives and families of those who had been executed for treason, and he gave £2,500 with a valuable farm to the father of Pestel, one of the chief conspirators. I have already mentioned in another page what Kinglake says in favour of the Czar Nicholas, and I need only add that he was "exemplary in all the relations of private life, a faithful husband, and an affectionate father;" whilst as a sovereign he was victorious over the Turks, but refrained from taking Constantinople, which he might, according to Wellington, have captured; and he had the laws codified, and the administration of justice purified, accelerated, and reformed.

The sovereigns of other countries, with half the abilities and worth of the Russian Emperors, are lauded to the skies, but such is the force of prejudice and ignorance that many seem to doubt if any good thing can come out of Russia.

A large portion of the English press teems with daily abuse, falsehood, and vituperation against Russia, reminding one, for its impotent abjurgations, of the celebrated curtain lectures of Mrs. Caudle, which used to amuse us formerly in the best days of *Punch*, but without their humourous fun, which has been supplanted by simple ill-nature.

It is surely not by frantic abuse of either a nation or an individual that we can expect to retain them in the right path, or, if they have wandered from it, to reform them; and, as prophecies lead to their own fulfilment, so individuals and even nations may be diverted from the path of justice by seeing that their motives and actions are misconstrued and calumniated, whilst those who have faith in the rectitude of individuals or of nations generally find their confidence amply repaid. England cannot afford to lose one of the few really friendly nations who are allied to us, and if we cultivated amicable relations with Russia, we should find our reward in such a course in our hour of need. If France had only been neutral in the Crimean war, and if prudent Prussia had joined us in the alliance with Turkey, the union of Germany would probably never have been effected, and France would not have been obliged to give up two provinces and to pay a war

indemnity of £200,000,000. It is perfectly clear that France now sees her mistake, and that her only hope of a successful war of revenge lies in the Russian alliance. Even if Russia annexed Constantinople and converted the Black Sea into a Russian lake, France sees she would lose little or nothing by it, and even if she did lose something, she would gladly put up with it, provided a much greater loss fell upon Germany.

The *Times* says, "Many thousands of Russian soldiers and horses have encamped at Ban Jassi, near Bucharest, during the march to the Danube, but the most scrupulous care has been observed towards the growing crops. The discipline of the troops has been so good that they appear and disappear by thousands without attracting the attention of the citizens of Bucharest."

Colonel Baker, who, like another Balaam, went to Turkey to curse the Russians, inadvertently "lets the cat out of the bag," cuts the round from under his own feet, and blesses the Russians altogether, for he naïvely admits, "The Russians are the most chivalrous and charming enemies, and very pleasant friends."

The *Figaro* of Paris of 1st July says, the Russians "found fifteen Turkish corpses which the runaways had not time to carry away. They were respected even to what their pockets contained, which the Russian soldiers did not examine, in their disdain for men who had mutilated their countrymen."

At last, about two months after the declaration of war, English officers, employed by the Ottoman Government, have received notice that they have till the 5th of July to choose between English and Turkish service, and Hobart Pasha has been removed from the British Navy List for the second time, with, no doubt, the understanding that he will be again replaced at the end of the war, and receive all his arrears of pay.

We do not hear of any French, Italian, German, or American mercenaries, filibusters, or renegades fighting on the anti-christian side, and the Swiss are now debarred from taking service under any foreign government, and it is, I think, no wonder that the military *attaché* of England (Colonel Wellesley) has been received with marked coldness at the head-quarters of

the Russian army, whilst the French and Italian military *attachés* have been received with the utmost courtesy, especially as he is well known to have shown a marked hostility to Russia even in the society of St. Petersburg, where he was most hospitably treated, and that he sent home reports, which were communicated to other governments, most disparaging to the Russian army and nation.

The Russians are to be severely blamed, according to the Philo-Turkish press, because they do not cordially welcome the representative of a nation whose press, with but few honourable exceptions, is constantly maligning them without the slightest regard to fair play or truth, and which gloats over every real or supposed misfortune which may happen to them, and eagerly hails any true or fictitious successes of the barbarous Turks, and glosses over and palliates their habitual cruelties towards the Christians. Of course the Russians ought to entertain the most affectionate feelings to Hobart Pasha and those other English officers who have been instrumental in checking their advance, and in killing and wounding their relatives and friends, and one cannot but wonder at their blindness in resenting these services. The excellent conduct of the Russian army is further proved by the following statement in the *Times* of June 28th :—

"The mosque of Matchin is carefully guarded, and no Russian soldiers are allowed to enter it. When the Turkish troops evacuated Matchin they advised the inhabitants to leave, but many of the Turks remained, and have been well treated by the Russian troops."

The *Times* says, July 12th :—"Meanwhile, what is the attitude of the people here (in Bulgaria)? It is nothing to say that the Russians are received here with joyful acclamations, that people hung about them with thanks, and young girls brought them flowers. All this might possibly have been arranged beforehand, and mean no more than that they wished to conciliate their new masters. To English minds a far better proof of good feeling will be the fact that the houses are readily opened to the victors, and that all who can supply them with food and drink refuse to

accept any payment. The languages are so nearly alike, that the Russian speaks in Russian, the Bulgarian in Bulgarian, and they understand each other. There is no mistaking the good feeling with which the people meet them, and one can only sigh and say, 'Would that the release of this people had been helped, not hindered, by England!'"

To show that the Christians of Bulgaria welcome the Russians as deliverers, I quote the following from the *Times* military correspondent at Tirnova:—"As our little column approaches each village the Turks slink out at the other end, and the ringing of bells first expresses the joy of the Bulgarians. They flock to meet the soldiers, always bringing water, flowers, bread, and such fruit as there is. . . . The soldiers drink greedily (water), but are not allowed to touch wine or spirits on the march, and the first request made by Prince Eugene, when encamping near a village, is that the people will not bring out any strong drink for the men. The result is good. So far I have only seen one man the worse for liquor. Above all, that town (Tirnova) has sent forth an agonizing cry which, however it may read at an English breakfast table, appeals to the hearts of men (the Russians) who are living for a time a life of struggle and danger. . . . The Dragoons (Russians) follow the retreating enemy, and from which they (four battalions of Turks) have fled from a few Dragoons, assisted by a few rounds of artillery fire. . . . Never was there a more disgraceful panic. Infantry with guns literally frightened away by a few horsemen. One of the strongest positions taken by cavalry and horse artillery. . . .

"No doubt now as to the welcome of the Russians; the poor people literally wept, prayed, and hung upon the necks of their deliverers, who were almost smothered in flowers. One saw rough cuirassiers of the Guard and dirty dragoons grinning with delight as they carried armfuls of flowers, as much as they could possibly manage, and have their hands seized and kissed by pretty delicate girls. There were no triumphal arches got up, no expressions of enthusiasm. Everything that was done came evidently and directly from the heart—the heart relieved from an intolerable yoke, and

a great and immediate danger. No one who has seen the entire and childish abandonment of this people to joy at their deliverance would have any other feeling but joy that it has been relieved. They treated me also as a saviour. Alas! I was only there to relate how another nation had saved them; and from how terrible a fate—not death only—but that living death which comes from a state of unutterable shame. . . . Russia alone has made her greatness felt, and the other nations of Europe are (to the Bulgarians) abstractions.

"The behaviour of the people to the Turks has been decidedly good. At first some of the Turks' houses were entered, and furniture taken away, but that sort of thing soon ceased. A committee was formed under the Archimandrite to watch over Turkish property, and such of the young men as have not already shouldered the rifle have turned themselves into special constables for the time being. Their pride is to show that they are superior in civilization to the Turks."

The Russian Minister of War, with his penny wise and pound foolish policy, is as highly blameable as the Prussian Minister of the same department, in not having provided the Russian soldiers with the best possible rifle, for, says *Truth*, "The Turks, having discovered that their rifles have a longer range than those of the Russians, go into battle with a firm conviction that they hold victory in their hands, and press forward with the rush of fiends to meet the foe." However, in the Franco-German war, though the French had a far better rifle than the Germans, they were, nevertheless, totally defeated.

As to the results of our meddling and muddling policy on the Eastern Question, the *Times* correspondent states:—"I had a long conversation the other day with an Armenian who has been for twenty years connected with Turkish journalism, and is still on the staff of one of the principal Turkish papers. He protested with great bitterness and, as it seemed to me, with perfect sincerity, that England was responsible for the war; that, but for English policy, Turkey would not have stood out against the wishes of Europe. It was the arrival of the fleet at Besika Bay that first encouraged

Turkey to reject the Berlin Memorandum. It was by the advice—not indeed the avowed—but the secret advice of England that Turkey again rejected the proposals of the Conference. At the last moment she would have accepted the Protocol if she had been made clearly and unmistakeably to understand that England really intended to adopt a policy of neutrality. A corresponding conclusion was, that if any attempt were made to bring the British fleet through the Dardanelles under pretext of protecting Constantinople, England ought to be distinctly told that the Porte did not require her protection on any terms, and that she could enter the Straits only as the avowed ally of Turkey, and, consequently, the avowed enemy of Russia."

At a Tory Opposition fish dinner the late Sir Robert Peel once proposed a toast remarkably unlike a blessing for the Liberals: "May we avoid their flounders and may we get their plaices;" a witty chancellor adding, "and d—— their soles."

Lord Granville wittily said on this topic, "I admit that we have watched with mixed feelings of admiration and awe the enormous flounders of the present Government at home and abroad. Fancy what a water souchet the Besika Bay flounders would alone provide;" and even the Turks will not allow "Dizzy" to play the game of *Bezique* much longer.

It is to be hoped that Russia will gain such signal and immediate triumphs, that the Balkans will henceforth become the northern frontier if Turkey continues to exist. This would, I believe, be in the permanent interests of peace, and therefore in our interests.

The reports of the gentle treatment by the Russians of the inhabitants of the conquered towns, and, above all, that they pay for all they take, have together done much to moderate the terror which their coming had inspired.

As to the passage of the Dardanelles to Russian men of war should we ourselves submit to such a condition *mutatis mutandis*. Should we even agree that no ships of war should go through the Suez Canal? Would France agree that her Mediterranean fleet must never pass through the Straits of Gibraltar, and her Atlantic fleet never enter the Mediterranean by these Straits?"

THE WILL OF PETER THE GREAT PROVED TO BE A FORGERY.

M. THEODORE JUSTE, an eminent Belgian historian, has recently published a work on the pretended Will of Peter the Great, which he does not hesitate to pronounce spurious; adding, "one recognises in this vehement composition the ideas and the claws of Napoleon." An abridgment of the Will was forged by a writer named Lesur, in 1812, when the French were burning to avenge the defeat and destruction of their army in the Russian campaign; and in another work published in 1814 against Russia Lesur acknowledges in the preface that he had written this second work at the command of the French Government. Sir Robert Wilson, in his private diary, published in 1861, says, that among the effects abandoned by the French, in the retreat from Russia there was a great quantity of Lesur's first work, containing the abridgment of the Will, and he says that the work was published under the immediate superintendence of the French Government. Lesur had written another pamphlet in 18 against Russia, but there is no mention of this Will which he h not then been instructed to forge. In the introduction to th pamphlet of 1812, he says, "We are assured that there exist in the private archives of the empire of Russia secret memoirs written by the hand of Peter the Great, where the projects which this Prince had conceived are explained without concealment." The first twelve of these fourteen heads are evidently prophecies, much after the events. In the other two, Lesur abandons accom-

plished facts for the realms of imagination, and talks of a "cloud of Asiatic hordes, ferocious and greedy of booty," as if Peter the Great would have spoken thus of his own subjects. These hordes are to penetrate by force into Italy and France, to massacre the inhabitants of these countries, and to drag them into slavery in the deserts of Siberia. He does not say he saw the Will, either in Russian or in a French translation, but merely repeats from hearsay; and Voltaire tells us that Peter the Great was wholly unacquainted with French. One does not see why the Russians should massacre the people of France and Italy if they submitted to the Emperor's authority, especially as they would have got more revenue out of the country with inhabitants than without them; nor, how they could be dragged into captivity if they had been previously massacred; nor why, in a scheme for conquering the world, the means of getting the better of the English, who are spoken of with such peculiar respect, are not stated?

It was the author (in association with Alexandre Dumas) of the successful, but extravagant, drama of the "Tour de Nesle," Gaillardet, who in 1836 first published the complete Will in French, in the "Memoirs of the Chevalier d'Eon," stating that that individual brought it to France in 1757, and placed it in the hands of Louis XV. and his Minister of Foreign Affairs, and that it was a literal copy; but if so, it must have been in Russian, which the Chevalier d'Eon did not understand, and why cannot it now be seen and accurately translated, since it must still be in the archives of France?

All the contemporary memoirs of the Chevalier d'Eon, however, were silent as to his great influence in Russia, or as to the Will of Peter the Great, and in the "Memoirs of the Empress Catharine," which gives the fullest details of the life at court, his name is not even mentioned. Gaillardet pretends "that this document was kept in the archives of the castle of Peterhof, in the neighbourhood of St. Petersburg," but in this summer residence of the Czars there are no archives at all!

In the text of the Will, section 12 directs Russia "to attach and

unite round itself all the disunited Greeks, or schismatics, as if Peter the Great would call his own church schismatical?

It is clear that Gaillardet thought some of Lesur's text much too improbable, as he omits several long passages which Lesur published; amongst others this: "They (the Russian armed fleet) will appear suddenly in the Mediterranean, and in the ocean, to pour forth all their nomad people, ferocious and greedy of booty, to inundate Italy, Spain, and France, of whose inhabitants they will massacre a portion; another they will drag into slavery to repeople the deserts of Siberia, and they will put the rest in such a state that they cannot break the yoke." It will be observed, too, that clause xiv. of the Will directs that these Asiatic hordes shall start in vessels under the convoy of the Black Sea and Baltic fleets, from the ports of Azov and Archangel; and apparently, like most Frenchmen, Gaillardet was so ignorant of geography, that he fancied the port of Archangel was on the Baltic, whilst in fact it is on the Arctic Ocean (rather a cold and uninviting place for the hordes of Central Asia); besides, how could these Asiatic hordes be conveyed to Archangel? and why should they not rather have been embarked at the Russian ports on the Baltic, which are far nearer to their country, and to their predatory destination? So shrewd a man as Peter the Great, who had visited England, Holland, and other countries, and knew that the fleets of the Western Powers must necessarily be far superior to any fleet which Russia could man, even if a benevolent fairy gave her the ships for nothing, must have foreseen that until nearly the whole of Europe was conquered by a land army, a task in itself impossible, he would have no chance of contending at sea with England alone, still less with a combination of the fleets of the European Powers; and this ridiculous Will does not tell us how the English and other fleets would be employed while this armada was being gathered for the conquest of Europe.

SKETCH OF PAST PHASES OF THE EASTERN QUESTION.

As one of the few members of Parliament who have visited Turkey, I shall now state my views on this engrossing question in the following pages. The principal reason which is given by most of those Englishmen who advocate the cause of Turkey is the supposed danger to our Indian Empire if Russia were victorious in a war with the Ottoman Empire; and it has been often, but erroneously, asserted that the defence of Turkey against Russia has been the traditional and invariable policy of England.

Even if this were the case, it would not be a sufficient reason for adhering to that course, if it is shown, as it has been, to have been useless and wrong, more especially under the totally different circumstances of the present crisis; and the *Times* admitted in 1861 as to the Crimean War, ten years before the Russians repudiated a portion of the Treaty of Paris: "Never was so great an effort made for so worthless an object. It is with no small reluctance we admit a gigantic effort and an infinite sacrifice to have been made in vain."

If Russia had invented some flimsy excuse for suddenly making an unprovoked attack on Turkey, had refused all offers of arbitration, had peremptorily declined the advice of England, and had openly declared that she would attack and endeavour to annex the whole Turkish Empire in Europe as a step to the conquest of India and of the world, in accordance with the forged Will of

Peter the Great, and if the Christians had been wisely and justly governed by the Turks, we might possibly have been justified in defending Turkey; but even then we should have been no more bound in honour to do so unless all the other guaranteeing Powers had joined us than we were to defend Denmark against Germany. But in the present case, as Russia has waited patiently for years to obtain the fulfilment of the fallacious and treacherous promises of the Sultan, upwards of twenty years ago, to do justice to its co-religionists and fellow-Sclavonians, as it has modified its very reasonable requirements beyond what the most sanguine friend of Turkey would have deemed possible, even at some sacrifice of its dignity and consistency, to meet the views of the other Powers, and especially of England; and as the cause of quarrel has been publicly stated by us to be most serious and just; I cannot see, now that Turkey has contemptuously, arrogantly, and foolishly refused the unanimous proposals of the Great Powers, how we could with any fairness endeavour to thwart Russia in nobly enforcing on the Porte the decisions of the Conference, even although the result might be the immediate overthrow of the Ottoman Empire and the occupation and annexation of Constantinople by Russia. On the contrary, we ought, I think, to be grateful to Russia if she, unaided, undertakes the heroic task of enfranchising ten millions of Christians from the tyranny of thirty millions of Mussulmans. If the happiness and welfare of the Christians of Turkey can only be secured by some remote and, I believe, imaginary risk to our Indian Empire, from which, unlike the Dutch, we exact no tribute, and which weakens our military resources in case of a European war by abstracting a large portion of our troops, we are bound to run that risk. But how can it be shown that we should be exposed to any danger, however trifling and distant, if Constantinople belonged to Russia? and what proof is there that Russia would endeavour to incorporate Turkey with her dominions, or that the Christians of Turkey, a large portion of whom speak a different language, and who notoriously wish to form independent states, could or would be compelled to

become Russian subjects, especially now that the Czar has pledged his honour that he does not wish to incorporate Turkey with his dominions? Supposing that Russia could annex the whole of Turkey, the maritime population of the enlarged Empire would not enable her to man a fleet which would approach being a match for the British navy, since our mercantile marine is about equal to that of the whole world combined; and if, contrary to all probability and experience, she made a piratical and unprovoked attempt to intercept our communications with India by making an attack on Egypt, our squadron at Malta would have a less distance to traverse, and would easily capture and destroy the Russian armada.

With strange inconsistency the very same individuals who are in such a state of alarm at the supposed danger which we even now incur in India from Russian ambition, and the still more imminent risk which we should run if Russia took Constantinople, declare that Russia is unable to vanquish Turkey single-handed, although the result of every war but one between the two countries for about two centuries has been the triumph of Russia; and they affect to think that some thirty-eight millions of semi-barbarous Moslems, weakened by the presence among them of about ten millions of disaffected Christians, and who are in a miserable minority in European Turkey, would be more than a match for eighty-six millions of civilised Russians, whilst, with 200 millions of Indian subjects, backed by a British army, superior in number to any which the Russians could send along the trackless deserts of Central Asia, we could not defend Hindostan against an invading army of Russians—in other words, whilst they hold that a Turk is equal to nearly three Russians, a superior number of Englishmen, near their resources, would not be equal to an inferior number of Russians at an immense distance from their base of operations, and though we should be supported by 200 millions of our Indian subjects, a large portion of whom are notoriously equal, if not superior, to Turkish troops.

Colonel Vincent has published a statement, which has been very favourably noticed by the press, in which, though he avows

himself a philo-Turk and anti-Russian, he admits that Russia has now an army of about 360,000 men on the Turkish frontier, and generals of the highest repute and experience, like Kauffman, Tchernayeff, and others, while the Turks have no commanders of reputation, and the Sultan could not bring into the field even 100,000 men to oppose them. And it will not be forgotten that Diebitch, in 1829, with only 110,000 men, vanquished the Turks, and dictated to them an ignominious peace; whilst at sea they are so contemptible that in the Greek war of independence, sixteen small Greek vessels chased forty large Turkish men-of-war to Constantinople. The inefficiency of the Turkish army and navy, as proved by a long series of defeats, is only exceeded by the venality which has signalised the leaders of both services; for when Paskiewitch attacked Asia Minor, he had no difficulty in inducing any number of the very same Mussulman troops who had fought against him to serve under his command. The battle of Nezib was won by Ibrahim Pasha against overwhelming odds by bribing the commanders of some of the Turkish regiments, and the whole Turkish fleet immediately afterwards deserted to the Pasha of Egypt. The anti-Russian party further say that Russia could not vanquish the Turks because she cannot raise a loan on the European money market; but as her Three per Cents. are at 51, whilst the Turkish Six per Cents. are at 8, it is clear that her credit is more than twelve times as good as that of Turkey; and no power whose Five per Cents. are at 81 has ever failed in getting a loan of reasonable amount; whilst Turkey could not obtain a shilling on any terms whatever. With reference to the charges of inordinate ambition, of pecuniary greed, and of atrocious cruelty in Central Asia, which have been unscrupulously brought against Russia, Mr. Gladstone, in his pamphlet on Russian policy in Turkistan, shows that, so far from there being any mutual hostility between England and Russia in those regions, England refused to take the part of the Khivans against Russia, and advised them to submit to the demands of the Czar, and the Russians refused to take the part of the exiled ruler of Afghanistan against England, on account of its friendship

for our country. He also states that when Hativizah was conquered by the Russians in 1870, they gave it back to the Amir of Bokhara, in spite of the desire of the people to be ruled by them; that the ruler of Khokand was a scoundrel, who had been repeatedly driven out by his subjects; that the Khan of Khiva might have been deposed and all his territories annexed, but that Russia refrained from doing so; that Tashkend was taken by Tchernayeff in 1864, contrary to the orders and wishes of the Russian Government, and that that officer was severely punished for his disobedience; that Russia has paid to the Mohammedan religion a respect so profound that missionary efforts are actually put down, a measure which we do not adopt even in India; that the annual expenditure of Turkistan was in 1872 five and a half millions of roubles, against a revenue of only two millions; that Schuyler, the American Consul, says, "The rule of Russia is, on the whole, beneficial to the natives, and it would be manifestly unjust to them to withdraw her protection and leave them to anarchy and to the unbridled rule of fanatical despots;" that Maghan says, "The conduct of the Russian soldiery in the Khivan campaign was infinitely better than that of European troops in European battles;" and that the Chinese Envoy said in his report to his Emperor of the conduct of the Russians, "The Dzian Dzian (General Kolpakofsky) of Semiretch quieted in every way those who remained in Suidun, both Mantchoos and Chinese, both soldiery and civil alike, as well as the Chinese Mussulmans, not harming any one. Not even a single blade of grass, nor a single tree, nor a fowl, nor a dog received any harm or injury, not a hair was touched, so that children were not frightened, and the people submitted, not without delight and ecstasy." Schuyler further says, "Strict orders were given by General Kauffman at the same time to the soldiers to send out no foraging parties, and to take nothing from the inhabitants, but to pay cash for everything at the bazaar; and in one case a soldier was sentenced to be hung for stealing a cow."

It should further be noted that, so far from showing an over-

weening desire for territory, which can only be acquired at a prodigious cost and held at a ruinous loss, Russia has sold, the whole of her possessions in America to the United States, for an old song, and has repeatedly restored to Turkey and Persia provinces that she has captured and might have annexed. Again, Russia refused for nearly seven years to aid the Greek insurrection, and if it were so inordinately ambitious it could easily conquer China, with which it is conterminous, with more than double the population of India, and which would have been subverted by the Taepings but for the skill of our own Gordon.

Even if the possession of Constantinople did menace at some remote date our Indian Empire, how do we know but that before that period arrived, when we had made in the meantime a long series of wars, and perhaps doubled our debt and risked our national existence to protect the effete and incorrigible Turks, we might be deprived of India by a new mutiny; or the three Empires might partition Turkey as they partitioned Poland; or France might aid Russia to conquer Turkey, on condition that Russia should aid France in a war of revenge against Germany or Turkey might be subverted by another Mehemet Ali; or Russia by an internal revolution, or by the re-establishment of Polish independence? Well did Jefferson say: "How much misery has been caused in the world by misfortunes which never happened."

That large number of persons who do not give themselves the trouble of reading history or of thinking for themselves, and who consider precedent the only safe rule, just as they would probably uphold the custom of Suttee if it existed in England, range themselves on the anti-Christian side because they erroneously imagine that England has always taken that course. It is erroneously supposed that the policy of England has always been to defend Turkey against Russia, but as I shall now show, the facts of the case prove the very contrary. From 1686 to 1877, a period of 191 years, there have been ten wars between Russia and Turkey, which have lasted cumulatively about forty-two years; and until 1787, though all but one, the Crimean war,

ended disastrously for Turkey, we never made the slightest attempt to aid the Turks, even by negotiation, still less by force of arms. In that year we first gave a little indirect and ineffectual aid to Turkey, but in the end we urged them to cede a considerable territory to Russia.

In 1806 we made war on Turkey, which had most ungratefully and treacherously declared war against us, in spite of our recent services in driving the French out of Egypt and Syria, and this, too, at the darkest moment of our death-struggle with Napoleon; and we then forced the Dardanelles and demanded the surrender of the Turkish fleet, *and the cession of Moldavia and Wallachia to Russia.* In 1812 we did not protest against the cession of the whole of Bessarabia and other territory to Russia. In 1815 we deprived Turkey of the Ionian Islands, which were tributary to the Sultan, and thus violated the integrity of the Ottoman Empire.

In 1826 the treaty of Akerman was signed, and the Sultan had the baseness to send a circular to Europe stating that when he signed the treaty he had not the slightest intention of being bound by it. This was an illustration of the perfidy of the Turk, which reminds me of a story of Mirabeau's brother, who said of himself, "I swore, indeed, but I did not promise to keep my word;" and on another occasion, "In any other family than my own I should be considered a rogue, but a clever fellow; in my own I pass for an honest man, but a dunce;" and again he said, "*Je suis payé mais non vendu.*"

In 1827 we joined Russia in destroying the Turkish fleet at Navarino, and in the establishment of Greek independence, thus placing the Turkish coasts at the mercy of Russia. Though the Duke of Wellington was hostile to the Greek revolution, and called Navarino "an untoward event," yet at the close of 1829 he said, "It would be absurd to think of bolstering up the Turkish power in Europe. It is gone, in fact. . . . We must reconstruct the Greek Empire. There is no doubt it would have been more fortunate and better for the world if the treaty of peace Adrianople) had not been signed, and if the Russians had entered Constantinople, and if the Turkish Empire had been

dissolved." In 1830 we acquiesced in the conquest of Algeria by France, which deprived Turkey of about three millions of subjects and a large tribute.

In 1833, when the Pasha of Egypt revolted, and his son Ibrahim conquered Syria and Asia Minor, and advanced within eighty leagues of Constantinople, we refused the supplications of the Turks for assistance, and they were obliged to implore the aid of Russia, which sent a squadron and an army, which occupied Constantinople with our consent. Yet the Russians, whom some suppose to be so faithless and unscrupulous, honourably retired when the danger of Turkey was over. In 1839 the Pasha of Egypt again rebelled, and after some months' delay, we for the first time supported Turkey by force of arms at the imminent risk of a war with France, which considered itself insulted by our conduct, and was burning to avenge Waterloo.

At that time our regular forces were under 100,000 men, of whom three-fourths were in Ireland or in the colonies, and not more than 25,000 men and 40 guns could have been collected to defend our shores against the 300,000 men and 300 guns which the French could have brought against us, whilst we had only three ships of the line and three frigates to guard the coast of the Channel against the French naval force, and we had only nine line-of-battle ships in the Mediterranean against fifteen French sail-of-the-line of much heavier weight of metal and more numerous crews than ours, supported by five Egyptian sail-of-the-line. Yet in 1840 we risked a defeat and even our national existence to prevent the ungrateful Turks from being regenerated by the more enlightened government of Mehemet Ali; and Russia, instead of joining France and Egypt against us, which would almost have insured our defeat, and instead of then securing Constantinople, as she might have done, by arrangement with France and Egypt, joined with us in maintaining, by force of arms, the integrity of that Ottoman Empire which she is persistently accused of wishing to appropriate.

In July, 1853, the Russians crossed the Pruth, but we did not declare war till March, 1854; and when peace was made, in

March, 1856, we did not, as we might have done, compel Russia after her defeat to surrender even the most recent of her conquests from Turkey, nor to pay any indemnity to that Power for a war which had weakened it, and injured its finances more than a large cession of territory.

In 1853, the mixed Commission decided in favour of the claims made by Russia as to the possession of the holy places by the Greek Church, to the unbounded irritation of the Latins, and especially the French, who had obtained a firman by threats of war on the pretext of an obsolete treaty one hundred years old, contrary to the recent firmans between Russia and the Porte. Prince Menschikoff then sent in an ultimatum to the Sultan, in which he demanded that in the Ottoman dominions the Greeks should have precisely the same privileges as the Latins, and that these privileges should be made perpetual and irrevocable. As the Sultan refused these just, necessary, and moderate terms, the Russians occupied the Principalities as a material guarantee.

The treaty of Kainardji, in 1774, it is quite evident, gave Russia the right of protecting the Christians in Turkey. It is not usual to put articles in treaties which have no meaning. If these articles were intended to have no meaning, why were they inserted? But there is further evidence of this, for Lord John Russell, in a despatch to Sir Hamilton Seymour, in 1853, said, "*The protection of the Christians of Turkey by Russia was no doubt prescribed by duty and sanctioned by treaty;*" and the Plenipotentiaries at Vienna of four Powers said it was necessary to abolish the exclusive protectorate which, for 180 years, had been exercised by Russia; so that, even if Russia's treaty right were insufficient, as forty years' prescription suffices in England, 180 years should be adequate for Russia. I can hardly state a higher authority than that for this assertion, for Lord John Russell was then Foreign Secretary, and England was responsible for any admissions he had made.

Lord Clarendon, too, stated in 1853, "The word of His Imperial Majesty (the Czar) would be preferable to any convention that could be framed. They (Her Majesty's Government) feel entire

confidence in the rectitude of His Imperial Majesty's intentions, and as they have the satisfaction to know that the interests of Russia and England in the East are identical, they entertain an earnest hope that a similar policy there will prevail."

A conference was then held at Vienna, at which the four Great Powers were represented, and on the 31st July, 1853, a Note was prepared by the Plenipotentiaries, which was immediately accepted by Russia without the slightest alteration, and which embodied the very principle for which she had all along contended, namely, equality between the Greeks and Latins, and permanence of those privileges which the Turks had been in the habit of alternately giving and withdrawing. The Porte insisted on important alterations, which would have left the oppressed Christians at their mercy, but these were instantly declined by Russia, and then the four Powers most inconsistently and unjustly sided with Turkey against Russia, whilst they were obviously bound in honour to adhere to that Note, and at first they expressed disappointment and dissatisfaction at the conduct of the Porte. The Turks then declared war, and commenced hostilities by firing on a Russian flotilla. The Russians, in their turn, subsequently sent a declaration of hostilities, and then the English and French fleets entered the Dardanelles, and instead of settling themselves the terms of peace, obsequiously asked the Porte what their terms should be.

The Porte demanded (1) Evacuation of the Principalities, (2) Revision of the Treaties, (3) Maintenance of religious privileges of communities of all confessions, (4) Definitive settlement of convention respecting the holy places; and we most absurdly approved of these terms, instead of insisting that the evacuation alone should suffice.

In November, 1853, the Russians destroyed the Turkish fleet at Sinope, and early in 1854 the Emperor of the French, who was leading England by the nose in the whole negotiation, wrote a hypocritical letter in favour of peace, to which the Czar replied, that long before the Russian occupation of the Principalities, when England hesitated to assume a hostile attitude, Napoleon took the initiative in sending his fleet as far as Salamis. That while

Napoleon makes it appear that the explanatory commentaries of the Vienna Note rendered it impossible for France and England to recommend its adoption by the Porte, he should have recollected that the Russian commentaries followed, and did not precede the pure and simple acceptance of the Note by Russia, and also their urgent recommendation of it to Turkey. Besides, the Czar added, "if any point of our commentaries had given rise to difficulties, I offered a satisfactory solution of them at Olmütz, and such it was considered by Austria and Prussia. Unfortunately, a portion of the Anglo-French fleet had entered the Dardanelles under the pretext of there protecting the lives and properties of English and French subjects, and in order to allow the whole to enter without violating the Treaty of 1841, *it was necessary that the Ottoman Government should declare war against us.* I learn for the first time from your Majesty, that while protecting the reinforcement of Turkish troops upon their own territory, the two Powers have resolved to prohibit to us the navigation of the Black Sea—that is to say, apparently to take from us the right of protecting our own coasts. Would you, yourself, Sire, if you were in my place, accept such a position? I boldly answer, No." (9th February, 1854.)

As to the Crimean war, I consider it a most foolish and wicked war, and one cannot but feel indignant at the weakness and cowardice of Austria in connection with that struggle. In my opinion, when we had induced the Russians to leave the Principalities the war should have ceased, but we were then tied to the chariot wheels of Napoleon III., the tyrant of France, and it suited his dynastic purpose to continue the war until the conquest of Sebastopol.

When Lord Aberdeen met Parliament in February, 1854, he said he could not "prove" that there was any danger to this country in the war between Russia and Turkey. Now, if there was no danger in February, it was difficult to understand how there could be danger in March, when war was declared, the affair of Sinope having happened in November, and everything being *in statu quo;* and I look forward with alarm to

the approaching Parliamentary recess, when the country might suddenly find itself "drifted into" a perfectly unnecessary and wrongful war.*

In February, 1854, Austria assured the English and French ambassadors at Vienna that, "if the two Western Powers would fix a day for the evacuation of the Principalities, after which, if the notice should be unattended to, hostilities should commence, the cabinet of Vienna would support the summons;" whilst Prussia declared that she was not called upon to engage in the struggle until her own interests were involved, which would only be the case if Russia, which then occupied the Principalities, should annex them. On this, Herr Von Vincke, the leader of the Prussian Liberals, said, "Instead of co-operating on the basis of that which she considers right and just, Prussia is making herself the post-boy or letter-carrier of Europe."

In consequence of this Austrian intimation, we stupidly and precipitately sent an ultimatum to Russia on 27th February, requiring the promise of the evacuation of the Principalities, but nothing else, by the 30th of April, and unless this pledge were given within six days, the British Cabinet would consider the silence of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg equivalent to a declaration of war. The answer of the Czar, as might have been anticipated, and as perhaps was desired, to this unnecessarily insulting and peremptory dispatch was, "*L'Empereur ne juge pas convenable de donner aucune reponse à la lettre de Lord Clarendon.*" Austria then having cleverly and unscrupulously led us on the ice, and committed us irretrievably to war with Russia, sneaked out of the quarrel and left us to our fate, having made as it were a fool's mate of us in the political game of chess. Obviously, Austria and Prussia, as every one now sees, though we were then as blind as bats, have the chief interest in preventing Russia from acquiring either the mouths of the Danube or Constantinople, and they were, as it were, by the irresistible force of

* Kinglake tells us that at the meeting of the Cabinet which adopted the dispatch which led to the war the majority were asleep!

circumstances, in the front line of the battle, whilst England and France could, with the most perfect safety to their interests, have remained wholly aloof from the contest, and the most we could have been reasonably expected to do in case of a Russian annexation of the Principalities or of Constantinople, would have been to send our naval forces to control the Russian fleet, whilst Austria, and not only Prussia but Germany, should at their own cost have furnished all the land forces, and we have been made catspaws of to snatch the German chestnuts out of the fire.

Kinglake says on this subject :—"Of all the great Powers, Austria was the chief sufferer. Austria was on the spot. Austria was the Power which instantly and in a summary way could force the Czar to quit his hold, and yet the charge of undertaking a duty which pressed upon her more than upon any other State in Europe was voluntarily taken upon themselves by two States (England and France) whose dominions were vastly distant from the scene of the evil deed. It was much as though the forces of the United States and Brazil were to come across the Atlantic to defend Antwerp from the French, whilst the English looked on and thanked their enterprising friends for relieving them of their duty."

Napoleon, however, actually pretended, in his message to his credulous and obsequious Chambers, that "France had quite as much interest, and perhaps more, than England in the influence of Russia not being extended indefinitely over Constantinople, for to rule at Constantinople is to rule over the Mediterranean." Yet the Turks, who do rule at Constantinople, do not rule over the Mediterranean, nor would the Russians if they held Constantinople, for all the powers that border on the Mediterranean combined would not be a match for England alone; and though it would be monstrous for Russia to have a single port, even the coaling station at Villafranca, which Russia obligingly gave up in consequence of the jealousy of France, or the smallest squadron in the Mediterranean, no one, of course, could reasonably complain if, as the French have often boasted, it "became a French lake."

On the 20th April, 1854, Prussia and Austria signed a treaty by which both guaranteed each others' territories, and which declared that either the annexation of the Principalities or an attack on the Balkans was a necessary *casus belli*. The Russians evacuated the Principalities early in July, and the Austrians, after delaying ten weeks from the date of the signature of the treaty by which Turkey allowed them to occupy these provinces, and waiting some weeks after the last Russian had retired, moved bravely forward on the 20th of August, as soon as there was no possible risk of fighting, and by this occupation they shielded Russia from an attack on the part of the Turks, and released a large number of Russian troops, who were sent to fight against us in the Crimea. On July 25, Count Nesselrode told Austria: "We replied by silence to the summons of France and England, because it was couched in an offensive form, was preceded by open provocation, and was destitute of all conditions of reciprocity. If in the opinion of the Austrian Government the prolonged occupation of the Principalities was the motive of the war, it ought to be a consequence that when the occupation ceased the war should cease. If the interests of Austria and the whole of Germany should suffer temporarily from our operations on the Danube, they must suffer still more, as well as other neutral States, from the situation brought about by the maritime operations of France and England in the Euxine, the North Sea, and the Baltic."

Austria and Prussia both expressed their opinion that Russia, in evacuating the Principalities, "had removed the only ground of complaint which could justify a hostile attitude towards her;" but the French and English Governments took a widely different view, and would no longer be satisfied with the *status quo ante bellum*, and wickedly and foolishly involved both England and France in an aggressive war against Russia, which has cost us seventy-five millions of treasure and tens of thousands of lives, whilst it has retarded the emancipation of the Christians from Turkish oppression and cruelty, and the advance of Russia in civilisation, by nearly a quarter of a century. As we were duped

in the negotiations and entrapped into the war, so we were befooled in the conduct of the campaign.

In the attack on the Russian army at the Alma, the French, who were far more numerous, persuaded us to let them fight on the side which was protected by the guns of both fleets, whilst we were exposed; and in taking up the positions before Sebastopol we a second time were fools enough, with a smaller number of troops, to take up the most exposed and dangerous position, consequently we got nearly all the hard blows, whilst the French secured nearly all the so-called glory. We then continued that war until we had inflicted the greatest loss upon a nation which had been our oldest, our best, and our most consistent ally.

On 18th April, 1855, Lord John Russell, supported by M. Drouyn de l'Huys and Austria, proposed at Vienna a system of counterpoise in the Black Sea between Russia and Turkey, to which Russia agreed, and the war might then have terminated, and a very large part of the slaughter and pecuniary loss of the Crimean war might have been spared; but the French and English Governments refused to adopt this reasonable proposition, and in consequence both Lord John Russell and M. Drouyn de l'Huys resigned.

At last, in December, 1855, Austria, after repeated efforts, succeeded in bringing about negotiations for peace; but so bellicose were France and England that Count Buol stated that, when he sounded the Cabinets of Paris and London, "Although we found them imbued with the firm resolution not to lend themselves to the initiative of any overtures for peace, nevertheless, to our great satisfaction, we found such dispositions in those Cabinets as to lead us *to hope that they would not refuse to examine* and accept conditions of a nature to offer all the guarantees of a permanent peace." Considering that we were then victorious over Russia, it would have been more magnanimous and more consistent with nations which make such gushing professions of Christianity, to have generously tendered to Russia such conditions of peace as were consistent with its national honour, instead of taking, as we did, an unfair advantage of our victory, and inflicting on that

great country the indignity and wrong of limiting her fleet in the Black Sea (which was thus made into a Turkish lake) to an insignificant and insufficient number of vessels, and placing her coasts and the Christians of Turkey at the mercy of the barbarous and incorrigible Turks, expressly barring all the Powers, individually or collectively, from giving these oppressed Christians aid, whatever cruelties might be perpetrated upon them, even if, for instance, one-third of the whole population was either massacred or sold into slavery, as in the case of the Greeks at the end of the war of independence, whilst previously for 180 years the wretched Rayahs had enjoyed the constant protection of Russia.

Lord Aberdeen told a distinguished M.P., who repeated it to me, that he considered the Crimean War "*unjust and unnecessary*," and on the 30th January, 1855, Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Gladstone resigned.

Lord Grey, too, said, "I think now as I thought then—that the Crimean War was unnecessary, and, therefore, unjustifiable. I am of opinion that all the blood that was shed and all the treasure that was expended in the course of that memorable contest has had the effect of leaving matters in the East in a worse position than they otherwise would have been."

Soon after the conclusion of peace, the question of the relation of the Principalities to Turkey arose. Russia, and even France, wished to erect them into a separate kingdom; but Austria and England, true to their retrograde policy, wished to keep them in strict subservience to the Porte. On this subject the *Times* remarked in 1858, "Diplomacy does, indeed, cut a sorry figure in this matter. First, she regarded the provinces as so important to Turkey that she went to war rather than suffer them, even for a time, to be rent from her; then she referred what was really the question of their future connection with Turkey to the people themselves; she overruled their decision because she wished them still to be dependent on Turkey; and she has now apparently ended by giving them a constitution which annihilates their dependence as effectually as if they had been formally united into a single kingdom; and in performing this feat she has kept the

provinces in an unsettled and miserable state for what, doubtless, appears to great diplomatists the very moderate period of two years and a half."

In the same year the Turks, who are so indignant at any of their territory being taken from them, declared Tunis an integral part of their Empire; and only last year the Khedive made an unprovoked and unjust war on Abyssinia, hoping to annex further territories to Egypt, and consequently to the Turkish Empire, but was ignominiously defeated by the brave Abyssinian Christians in spite of the aid of renegade Europeans.

In 1854 the Turks, who are now so tenacious about their dignity and imaginary independence, agreed to the occupation of the Principalities by Austria for two years, and in 1860 they consented to an armed occupation of Syria by the French for nearly a year after one of those periodical massacres which occur so frequently in Turkey; yet, forsooth, they will not allow Bulgaria, after they have committed even worse horrors than on other occasions, for which they have decorated and rewarded some of the chief perpetrators, to be occupied temporarily even by a gendarmerie officered by foreigners.

In 1867 the European Powers agreed to recommend the Turks to give up Candia, instead of desiring to maintain the integrity of Turkey.

In 1871 the Russians very wisely seized the opportunity of the Franco-German War to repudiate the humiliating, oppressive, and unjust Treaty of Paris, by which the Russian coasts were placed at the mercy of the Turkish fleet, and the Turks were the very first to consent; so that, being without allies, and not caring to be more Turkish than the Turks, we were obliged to consent to see the chief result of the Crimean War irrecoverably lost. Yet though we only beat the Russians in the Crimea with the greatest difficulty with the aid of the French, the Sardinians, and the Turks, and with the indirect support of the Austrians, who occupied the Principalities, there are those who actually suppose we could now cope with Russia supported by Turkey alone, at such an enormous distance from our supplies, and with the risk of

having Germany against us, grateful for the friendly neutrality of Russia during the Austrian and Franco-German Wars, and perhaps Austria, which might probably be won over by Russia by the promise of a large slice of Turkey; while Roumania, Greece, Crete, Egypt, Servia, and Montenegro probably would take the opportunity of declaring war against Turkey and joining Russia; and heterodox Persia might take the opportunity of appropriating some of the territory of the orthodox Mussulmans of Turkey, and especially Mesopotamia, which contains their sacred places.

In 1873 England was obliged to check Turkish aggressions in South Arabia, tending to impede our communications with India.

In 1874 Austria, Germany, and Russia informed the Turks that they considered themselves justified in concluding separate treaties with Roumania, and they paid no regard to the protest of the Turks. Some years ago we too infringed the integrity of Turkey, by annexing Aden and Perim, to the great indignation of the French, who themselves had annexed Algiers.

The "west-end" seem to think that Christianity and demoralization go together in the case of the Rayahs, whilst Mahometanism and all the virtues characterise the Turks; but if this is so, why do they not turn Mussulmans? Then, besides giving encouragement to Turkey, we have insulted Russia in every way.

It is currently stated that there is a division among the Ministers of the Crown on this subject. In the newspapers I find the subject commented on and names given. I think it is clear that there are three parties in the Cabinet. The general opinion is, that the Prime Minister, the Secretary for War, and the Postmaster-General are strong for Turkey, and would have been quite willing to have launched us into a war in support of Turkey against Russia. On the other hand, I believe there are Lord Salisbury, the Lord Chancellor, and the Home Secretary, who are in favour of the Christians in Turkey. But half the Ministers are neutral, and as the wind blows in one quarter or another, they change sides. In short, the Ministry have boxed the compass of political vacillation. A great deal has been said about Mohammedans sympathising

with the Sultan, but there are no fewer than 165 millions of Mohammedans, of whom only thirty-eight millions are Turks, and the general body of Mohammedans do not regard the Sultan as their head.

There are some who think that Europe should have faith in the gimcrack and illusory Constitution which Turkey has granted, and by which a large majority of Mussulmans have just been returned in European Turkey, with a few discredited Christians, in a population in which the Turks are in a small minority; but all our leading politicians have declared their want of confidence in it, and as Midhat Pasha, its author, thanks to his own Constitution, has escaped the bowstring, and has been exiled, the project will probably soon collapse. It would be impossible to work a Parliament in which the different nations of Europe were represented, though we are all Christians—all civilized, and accustomed to free institutions; but a Parliament consisting of the same barbarous Turks, of polyglot languages, most of them believing in a base, superstitious, and persecuting religion, and many of them addicted to unnatural vices, to polygamy and white slavery, is an utter absurdity. Yet the Turks coolly invite us to wait no less than four years to see how it works! This is traversing the narrow line which separates the Sublime from the Ridiculous Porte. The last time we trusted Turkey we spent, between debt and increase of taxes, about seventy-five millions sterling in the Crimean war, besides about thrice as much of which she has picked our pockets by means of loans; and if a war in her defence is really just and necessary for India, why should not India and our colonies bear their share of the expense? whilst the Turks should pay the remainder, until we could recover the cost from Russia; and the British lives thrown away in riveting the chains of fanatic Mussulmans on the poor Christians of Turkey, and the loss of credit by doing this for a selfish object, would be a sufficient contribution on the part of England. One can easily understand why the Roman Catholics side with the Turks, as the Russians and the Christians of Turkey are Greeks, and religious sects hate each other in inverse propor

tion to their differences; and we can also comprehend why the Hungarians take the same side, and have sent a sword to Abdul Kerim Pasha, since they have never forgiven Russia for putting down their rebellion in 1849; and, while claiming freedom for themselves, they have always dreaded and tyrannised over their Sclavonic fellow-subjects; but it is astounding that Protestant Englishmen should have any sympathy with bloodthirsty Turks, and should not prefer a progressive nation like the Russians, who have abolished serfdom at enormous cost, who have established liberty of the press, and who may soon be expected to obtain a real and not a sham Constitution. It is quite evident from the first debate in the House of Commons that the present Government do not intend to go to war with Russia even if she does attack Turkey, and the Liberal party are disposed to compel Turkey, by force of arms if necessary, to accept the decision of the Conference, provided the other powers will join us, but not to help Turkey under any circumstances. The Turks, on their part, are by no means sanguine as to the result of the war with Russia, as appears from the report of the meeting of their Grand Council in the *Allgemeine Zeitung;* and whilst the Patriarchs of the Christians pretend to be warmly attached to the Ottoman cause, it is impossible for anyone to believe they are sincere; for though the Greek Patriarch, on the occasion of the Greek war of independence, declared against his country and his religion, this did not prevent him from being murdered, with every aggravation of cruelty, by the Turks; and there can be little doubt that these servile Patriarchs will share the same fate if war ensues. At the Turkish Council, Rushdi Pasha, late Grand Vizier, said, "In the progress of history, considerable portions of the Ottoman Empire have passed into the hands of Austria and Russia; but great as has been the damage inflicted upon us by these losses, it was less injurious than the semi-independence accorded to Servia and Montenegro." So that, if the Turks had their way, they would reduce the Principalities to the same miserable level as Bosnia and Bulgaria, and these provinces can never expect to be placed on the same footing as Servia.

The Grand Vizier, Midhat Pasha, said, "You are aware that we have no money, and that the portals of the money market are closed against us. No army can be supported without money."

Rifaat Bey said, "We have reason to fear the issue of the war should war break out;" and the Grand Vizier then said, "Who knows what may be in store for us if we go to war? Before long we may have no bread, and people may be driven to wish the Conference programme had been accepted. . . . It should be remembered that public opinion is against us in all Europe. . . . Public opinion is stronger than any other power." As to the arrogance of the Turks, it suffices to quote Abedin Bey: "We are proud to think that in consequence of our answer six ambassadors will leave Constantinople simultaneously. It redounds to the glory of the Ottoman race that we are going to give the whole lot of them one reply." Our selfish and foolish policy has alone prevented the Christians of Turkey from being enfranchised from Mussulman cruelty and oppression more than half a century ago, and most of the atrocities of the Greek war of independence would have been prevented, without our going to war, if we had not held back Russia by our advice and the fear of our intervention in favour of Turkey. Either we were wrong in destroying the Turkish fleet at Navarino, and thus establishing Greek independence, or if, as I believe, we were right, we should have adopted that step several years sooner, and thus saved about one-third of the population of Greece from death or slavery, whilst we should also have prevented the sacrifice of the lives of hundreds of thousands of our esteemed friends the Turks who perished in that hopeless struggle. The infamous and unparalleled massacre of Scios in 1822 resulted in the murder of 25,000 persons, whilst 45,000 women and children were sold into slavery, and 15,000 escaped, and only 1,800 out of a population of 85,000 remained on the island alive. Yet we not only would not interfere, but for years prevented other nations from putting an end to atrocities compared with which the customs of Dahomey are merciful. As to thesupposed sympathy of the Mussulman races for Turkey, Sir George Campbell, who is a first-rate authority on this subject,

states that the Mussulmans of India, many of whom are heterodox Shiites, would not resent our going to war with Turkey for the Christians. The Mussulmans of Russia are quite loyal, and Lady Duff Gordon says in her book on Egypt, that the Egyptians were strongly in favour of the Cretans in their insurrection, and long to be free of Turkish domination; and the Khedive, who managed to send about 50,000 men against Abyssinia, has only despatched 3,000 extra men to aid Turkey, in addition to his small contingent of 9,000. Whatever may be the solution of the Eastern Question—whether the Turkish possessions in Europe are divided between the Slavs and Greeks, and the Greek Empire is re-established, or the greater portion of Turkey is absorbed by Russia, or whether Constantinople is made into a free and neutral city like Frankfort or Hamburg formerly were, with the fortifications of the Dardanelles destroyed and perpetually abolished, the Mussulmans can live in greater happiness and comfort at present under an enlightened and progressive Christian Government, than under a stupid and perverse tyranny, which farms the tithe to rogues, who insist in taking it in kind, and let the crops rot in the ground till it suits their convenience or interest to collect as much as they can extort; and the Mussulmans of Turkey would be as well off as those of India, Algeria, Russia, or China, whilst those who are dissatisfied with Christian rule can sell their possessions, as was done on the occasion of the establishment of Greek independence, when the Greeks agreed to sell their possessions in Turkey, and the Turks theirs in Greece.

As an illustration of the results of Ottoman domination, history tells us that in the days of Pericles, Athens contained 21,000 freemen and 400,000 slaves, and the gross revenue of Athens after the battle of Cheronea, when all its foreign colonies had been lost, was equivalent to £500,000 of our money, whilst in November, 1826, its population was reduced to 9,040, and the revenue of Attica to £3,000 a year.

HISTORY OF THE PRESENT PHASE OF THE EASTERN QUESTION.

In January, 1875, a large number of the peasantry of Herzegovina, to escape from unjust exactions and imprisonment at the hands of the tithe farmers, fled to Montenegro. At the request of the Prince of Montenegro, Dervish Pasha, the Governor of Herzegovina, agreed to let them come back, and offered them an amnesty. But they were stopped on the frontiers by Turkish troops, and two of them were killed. Dervish explained that the soldiers had acted without orders, but after the people did come back to their homes they were exposed to outrage and insult. Their houses were burnt, some of them were beaten, and one was put to death. Resistance followed, and the month of June saw the beginning of a desultory contest. In England, if a man is injured in a railway accident, the company has to pay enormous damages; but in Turkey, it appears that the compensation to the family for killing a peasant intentionally is to burn his house down and to have recourse to a general beating all round.

According to the admission of the Turkish press, the value of the plundered and destroyed property of the Bulgarians, in the district of Philippopolis alone, was £2,000,000, whilst the Commission, up to January 26th, 1877, had only expended about £20,000, or one-hundredth part of the damage, on the construction of houses and distribution of cattle and seed in some of the burnt villages (*Times*, February 14th, 1877). The real amount of the losses sustained by the Bulgarians in Philippopolis alone was much

greater, and the total losses of the Christians in Turkey were probably more than £6,000,000; but the British Government thought it quite impossible for the Turks to afford to give compensation to the Christians, though these same Turks can afford a war which may cost sixty millions or more, brought on entirely by their own obstinacy, stupidity, and arrogance.

Philo-Turkish Englishmen boldly assert, without a scintilla of proof, that these insurrections are got up by Russian agents, who first urge the peasants to rebel, and then induce the Turks to send Bashi-Bazouks to massacre them; and in this particular case they will perhaps allege that the Russians induced the tithe farmers to oppress the people, then the peasants to escape, and, lastly, the Turkish troops to beat and massacre them. Perhaps also the Russians induced the Turks to raise the tithes 12½ per cent., that there might be more money to buy munitions of war to be used against themselves.

A pamphlet, called "Secret Dispatches of General Ignatieff," has been published, and the author appears to think that against Russia even forged and poisoned weapons are justifiable, for these pretended dispatches, according to his own statement, were obtained by Khalil Cherif Pasha by bribing a member of the Russian Embassy at Vienna to betray his trust; and the author very naïvely says, "At first sight it would appear improbable that copies of letters emanating from so many different personages should be deposited in any one place;" and he might have added that, if such a scoundrel was found in the Russian Embassy, he would be pretty sure to supply any number of forged dispatches seasoned to the taste of his employers so long as money was forthcoming; but the probability is that these dispatches were forged, like the Will of Peter the Great, by Khalil Pasha himself, and if he was capable of bribing one of the Russian Embassy, he was equally capable of causing dispatches to be forged. These secret dispatches chiefly relate to ecclesiastical squabbles between the Orthodox and Bulgarian Churches; and as another sample of the way in which the Christians are treated in Turkey I find at page 39, "The Exarch (in December, 1874), at the Grand Vizier's re-

quest, waited on the Minister of Foreign Affairs to inform him of the wishes of the Bulgarian community. . . . Instead of listening to the explanation and wishes of the venerable prelate, the Ottoman Minister very haughtily stated that, the relations between the Orthodox and Bulgarian Churches not being the same as heretofore, the Porte had decided upon cancelling the firman promulgated under Ali." This anonymous pamphleteer, who is apparently ashamed to give his name in connection with pretended dispatches obtained by bribery, and who admits that "there is a natural dislike in all honourable minds to use documents that have been surreptitiously obtained," has discovered the following mare's nest, namely, that the enormous sum of 40,110 roubles (or £5,400) was spent by the Moscow Slavic Committee in the second quarter of 1872. I do not know whether the statement of this credulous and unscrupulous pamphleteer is correct, but Mr. Mackenzie Wallace tells us that the accounts of this Committee are published periodically, and that copies are freely given to foreigners. However, even on the new Junius's own showing, about £2,900 was for the support of 216 agents of this Committee at the Universities and special schools; £1,750 for ordinary expenditure of 65 permanent agents in Slav provinces of Austria as well as Turkey; and there remains the colossal sum of £750 per quarter, or £3,000 a year, called extraordinary expenditure of agents in Bohemia, Gallicia, and *Hungarian Russia* (?) as well as Bulgaria; and supposing two-thirds of this amount was spent in bribing, inciting, and arming the 3,732,300 Slavs in Turkey, it would give the magnificent, irresistible, and tempting sum of about half a farthing per head per annum, whilst the cost of a military substitute in France used to be from £100 and upwards in time of peace, and half a farthing would be a slender remuneration for the risk of being tortured and executed as a traitor.

After Khalil's conduct in obtaining, or pretending to obtain, Russian dispatches by bribery, the reader will not be at all surprised to learn by *Truth*, of July 26th, that he is now recalled from being Turkish Ambassador at Paris, because he has been posted as a defaulter at four clubs for 40,000 francs, which he has

lost but cannot pay. For more than a month he shrank from appearing in the Bois and on the Boulevards. He is, however, no worse than the average of Pashas, as will appear by another quotation from *Truth*:—"Redif must needs make a few more thousands out of the bread to be supplied to the devoted soldiers of the Ottoman army. Provisions were short in Armenia, and urgent telegrams came for supplies of biscuit. A hundred tons of filth, composed of mill sweepings and chaff full of insects, and utterly rotten, were passed as biscuit by the War Department, and would have been sent and taken credit for as food, but for the timely intervention of the Parliament. The scheme was blown upon, and, from that day, the Sultan began to look closely into details. The result has been the discredit of the man, who has done more in his nine months of power to wreck the hopes of the Empire than even Mahmoud Nedim, the avowed advocate of Russian interests."

Truth says:—"Khalil would have it believed that he bought, when he was Turkish Ambassador at Vienna, the dispatches of General Ignatieff, which have appeared in a pamphlet called *Les Responsabilités*, that has been published here (Constantinople); but this is a fanfaronade, for the very excellent reason that the dispatches in question were written by the compiler himself.

That strong Philo-Turk, Mr. Holmes, the British Consul (who does not understand the Christian languages), says he met a body of Turkish troops going to attack the insurgents, whom he had left, and who had been assured that they might assemble in safety. He and his colleagues were very indignant at a breach of trust which might have seemed to cast doubt on the good faith of the Consuls themselves.

The Herzegovinians complained that the so-called tithes * had been advanced to 12½ per cent., that the taxes had been collected with gross unfairness, that Christians were made to undergo forced labour on the public roads, that their horses were used for the

* A tithe is a tenth, and 12½ per cent. cannot be a tenth, any more than a quarter can be made a half.

service of the army, that the Agas were tyrannical, the courts corrupt, and property, life, and honour insecure; and actually these misguided peasants thought it a hardship that their evidence should not be receivable in a Court of Justice against a Mussulman. The Christians added that they would die rather than suffer such slavery.

Now Servir Pasha, the Turkish Commissioner, could not and did not deny any of these charges, but promised various reforms, such as that the Medjlis, or local councils, should be reorganised, the tithes should be levied on the land instead of on the growing crops, the taxes on animals should be reformed, administrative decrees and legal judgments should be translated into the Slav language, the requisition of horses should be abolished, and a committee of Turks, Greeks, and Catholics should be appointed to see that the new rules were put in force. On December 13th, the principles of these reforms were set forth by an Imperial firman. Thus, as Musurus Pasha said, "the edifice of which the foundation was laid by the firman of Gulhani in 1839, and the body completed by the Hatti Humayoun of 1856, was now crowned and made perfect by the second firman." It appears then, by the statement of Musurus, that it took no less than seventeen years to erect the structure of imaginary justice to the Rayahs, but after this long period it was so rotten and insufficient that, instead of being crowned, it was rebuilt in 1875. The Turkish promises, like pie crust, are only made to be broken, and as the Imperial hatts have no crowns, the promises poured in at one end pass instantly out at the other. Hypocritical and false as Turkish promises are, the poor Christians often cannot even obtain this counterfeit coin when they complain of the grinding oppression under which they groan, and experience has now taught them that they are as utterly valueless as Bank of Elegance notes. The Turkish promises remind me of a story of a person who went to Yorkshire to buy a valuable horse, and bribed the groom to tell him its faults, the first of which was, that when he was turned loose in a field he was very hard to catch; but it was only with great pressure that the groom was induced to tell the second

and fatal fault, "when he is caught he is good for nothing," which is exactly the state of the case as to Turkish promises. After the labours of centuries we do not yet think our British institutions faultless, and are continually reforming them; in fact, Montesquieu once said, "The English Constitution is the best in the world, nevertheless it is detestable;" but the Turks, cleverer than ourselves, have in 1875, according to their view, constructed the only charter in the world which is absolutely "perfect."

The Christians of Turkey probably recollected that the edifice of Turkish perfidy was really "crowned and made perfect" so far back as 1826, by which the protectorate of Russia over the Christians was confirmed, when, on the occasion of the signature of the treaty of Akerman, the Sultan sent a circular to his agents, to say that, when he had signed the treaty, he had not the slightest intention of observing it, and if a solemn treaty with a powerful nation like Russia could be thus treated, how much less would a Sultan hesitate to break faith with the Rayahs, the Giaours, the infidel dogs of Christians.

On December 30th, 1875, the famous Andrassy Note was first made known to our Government, in a dispatch from the Austrian Chancellor to Count Beust. The Andrassy Note proposed that the revenue derived in Bosnia and Herzegovina from indirect taxation should be applied as before to the general purposes of the Ottoman Empire, while the income obtained from direct taxation should be spent on the province itself; complete religious liberty should be established; the system of farming the taxes abolished; and the execution of these reforms should be placed under the care of a special commission, half the members of which should be Mussulmans and half Christians. Count Andrassy also showed that much of the ill-feeling was caused by the fact that the Mahometans owned most of the soil and the Christians tilled it. Hence he urged that the State should sell portions of its waste lands to the peasantry on easy terms. After considerable hesitation the English Government, who are Turcicis-Turciores, at the instance of the Turkish Government, gave a general but feeble support to the Andrassy Note, and the Porte

accepted all the demands save the one defining the purposes to which the indirect and the direct taxes of the revolted provinces should be applied. It promised, however, that a certain amount, which might be a nominal sum, in the Turkish depreciated paper, should be set apart for local wants.

The Philo-Turks say that, though the Christians in Turkey may be occasionally massacred, it is not on religious grounds, and that no country is more tolerant than Turkey; but Count Andrassy says in his famous Note, "This fanatical hatred and this distrust must be attributed to the neighbourhood of peoples of the same race, enjoying in their plenitude that religious liberty of which the Christians of Herzegovina and Bosnia see themselves deprived—the construction of edifices devoted to religious worship and teaching, and the use of bells. The constitution of religious communities find themselves still subjected to obstacles which appear to the Christians as so many inveterate souvenirs of the war of conquest. . . . Restricted as they are, the concessions in question have always been insufficient to content the Christians. . . . In fact, the testimony of Christians against Mussulmans is received by the tribunals of Constantinople and of the greater part of the other large towns, but in some distant provinces, such as Herzegovina and Bosnia, the judges refuse to admit its validity. . . . In spite of formal declarations, the system of farming the revenue is still in force in its full extent."

It seems strange that we alone, of all nations of the world, should have hesitated to accept the Andrassy Note, and should be so very much more jealous of the independence of the Sultan than he is himself. It shows, too, how grinding and intolerant are the Turks, that, to keep the Christians in poverty, misery, and subjection, they will not even sell them the waste lands, and prefer losing revenue to allowing the Christians the bare possibility of prosperity.

The next event was the assassination by the Turks of Salonica, in their own mosque, of the French and German Consuls, for not even that is sacred to these barbarians. Upon this, France and Germany sent joint squadrons to Salonica, where the funerals of the

Consuls were celebrated with great pomp, large bodies of French and German soldiers, in defiance of the obsolete principle of Turkish independence, patrolling the streets, and one or two of the culprits, after trial, were executed. The French and Germans, however, forgot to demand a heavy pecuniary compensation for the families of the victims, which the Turks would have felt more than the execution of one or two obscure culprits.

We come now to the Bulgarian insurrection, which broke out on April 20th, 1875, caused by the same tyranny, cruelty, and oppression as in the case of Herzegovina and Bosnia. In fact, it is as impossible for the Turk to act justly as it is for the tiger to change his skin or the leopard his spots. The insurrection was at first suppressed, and the various Turkish Commissioners, in their report, affirmed that, though at Avrat Alan the insurgents seized about one hundred Mussulmans of all ranks, and "killed them one by one with the utmost refinement of cruelty," yet, when those very rebels capitulated, they did not lose a single man, and "have not had to suffer any bad treatment on the part of the soldiers." The Bulgarians, according to these Commissioners, set fire to their own villages as well as to those of their Mussulman neighbours. The Turkish troops, in their measures of repression, only slew 1,836 Bulgarians. The rebels killed in all 530 Mussulmans. Upon the restoration of order, and the return of those insurgents who were not detained as prisoners to their homes, the Mussulmans gave back to their Christian friends the property of the latter, which they had saved from the burning villages. Such was the interesting result of the historical amity in which, according to the Commissioners, the Bulgarians had lived for centuries with their Moslem compatriots, "under the *ægis* of the laws and the paternal protection of the Government." This is certainly a touching picture of the lion lying down with the lamb, but somewhat too good to be true. *Credat Judæus Apelles.*

A series of admirable letters in the *Daily News* now informed the world of the foul series of bestial and infamous atrocities perpetrated by these Turkish fiends, and of which the Turkish Commissioners had just given this false and fraudulent account;

and on September 6th, Mr. Gladstone, to his eternal honour, published his first pamphlet on the subject, which excited the horror and execration against barbarous, incorrigible, and cruel Turkey, not only of England and Europe, but of the whole world.

Mr. Baring soon after published his report, in which he states that "*no fewer than* 12,000 *persons perished in the Sandjak of Philippopolis alone*," while he believed that the whole number of Mussulmans killed by the Christians in this formidable rebellion was only 163; so that, instead of the old law of retaliation, which claims a life for a life, the Turks consider about eighty Christian lives equivalent to that of one Moslem. Probably a very much larger number than 12,000 perished in the Sandjak of Philippopolis alone, as Mr. Baring is almost as rabid a Turcophile as Sir H. Elliott, and in his reports is continually evincing his reluctance to believe the Christians, and his credulity as to Turkish statements. Most likely from 20,000 to 30,000 were massacred throughout the disturbed provinces, as the Sandjak of Philippopolis does not probably include more than a tenth of the population of the disturbed provinces.

As to Batak, Mr. Baring says, "On May 9th, the inhabitants, seeing that things were going badly with them, and that no aid came from without, had a parley with Achmet Aga, who solemnly swore that, if they only gave up their arms, not a hair of their heads should be touched. . . The villagers believed Achmet's oath and surrendered their arms, but this demand was followed by one for all the money in the village, which, of course, had also to be acceded to. No sooner was the money given up, than the Bashi-Bazouks set upon the people and slaughtered them like sheep. A large number of people, probably about 1,000 or 1,200, took refuge in the church and churchyard, the latter being surrounded by a wall. The church itself is a solid building, and resisted all the attempts of the Bashi-Bazouks to burn it from the outside; they consequently fired in through the windows, and, getting upon the roof, tore off the tiles and threw burning pieces of wood and rags dipped in petroleum among the mass of unhappy human beings inside. At last the door was forced in, the massacre com-

pleted, and the inside of the church burnt. . . The spectacle which the church and churchyard presented must be seen to be described. Hardly a corpse had been buried. . . I visited this valley of the shadow of death on July 31st, more than two months and a half after the massacre, but still the stench was so overpowering that one could hardly force one's way into the churchyard. In the streets at every step lay human remains rotting and sweltering in the summer sun. . . . From the remains of female wearing apparel scattered about, it is plain that many of the persons here massacred were women. It is to be feared also that some of the richer villagers were subjected to cruel tortures before being put to death, in hopes that they would reveal the existence of hidden treasure. Thus Petro Triandaphyllos and Pope Necio were roasted, and Stoyan Stoychoff had his ears, nose, hands, and feet cut off." Mr. Baring adds the all-important fact that "Achmet Aga had received for this exploit the order of the Medjidie, and he has since been condemned to death by a majority of five to one of even a Turkish tribunal, but never executed."

It is evident that Mr. Baring has considerably understated the real horrors of the Turkish atrocities, as will appear from contrasting his account with that of Mr. Schuyler, the American Consul, which I here subjoin; but this is not surprising, as Mr. Baring took with him M. Guarracino, his father-in-law, as Turkish interpreter, upon which General Ignatieff said it was an indication that the inquiry would not be a thorough one, and that M. Guarracino was hostile to him. Mr. Schuyler states:—"The inhabitants of some villages were massacred after exhibitions of the most ferocious cruelty, and the violation not only of women and girls, *but even of persons of the other sex.* The crimes were committed by the regular troops as well as the Bashi-Bazouks. It is very difficult to estimate the number of Bulgarians who were killed during the few days that these disturbances lasted, but I am inclined to put 15,000 as the lowest *for the districts I have named.* In one (village), an *old man was violated on the altar, and afterwards burnt alive.* . . From

the numerous statements made to me hardly a woman in the town escaped violation and brutal treatment. The ruffians attacked children of eight, and old women of eighty, sparing neither age nor sex. Old men had their eyes torn out and their limbs cut off, and were thus left to die unless some more charitably disposed person gave them the final thrust. Pregnant women were ripped open and the unborn babes carried triumphantly on the points of bayonets and sabres, while little children were made to bear the dripping heads of their comrades. This scene of rapine, lust, and murder was continued for three days, when the survivors were made to bury the bodies of the dead. The perpetrators of these atrocities were chiefly regular troops commanded by Fasli Pasha. Of the 8,000 inhabitants of Batak, not 2,000 are known to survive. Fully 5,000 perished here. . . . There was a house, the floor of which was white with the ashes and charred bones of thirty persons burnt alive. Here was the spot where a village notable was spitted on a pike and then roasted. . . . Here the schoolhouse, where 200 women and children who had taken refuge there were burnt alive. . . . *I am unable to find that the Bulgarians committed any atrocities that deserve the name.* I have vainly tried to obtain from the Turkish officals a list of such outrages, but have heard nothing but vague statements. No Turkish women or children were killed in cold blood; no Mussulman women were violated; no Mussulmans were tortured; no purely Turkish village was attacked or burnt; no Mussulman's house was pillaged; no mosque was desecrated or destroyed. The report of the Turkish Special Commissioner may be characterised as a tissue of falsehoods. In the Report of the extraordinaryTurkish tribunal, it is said that forty-nine villages, Mussulman and Christian, with 11,453 houses, were burnt by the insurgents!"

Some of the persons accused of rebellion—or rather of resisting the assassination of their relatives, the violation of their women, and the robbery of their property—were put upon their trial at Philippopolis; and so grinding is the oppression of the Moslem, that Mr. Baring says, as to the Special Commission, "When before

the latter they were defended by a Christian, but on the only occasion I attended the court it was hard to say whether the prisoners or their counsel displayed the most abject signs of terror." He proceeds to say, "The manner in which the rising was suppressed was inhuman in the last degree, fifty innocent persons suffering for every guilty one." In the case of military revolts, the ancient Romans sometimes had recourse to a practice which, even in those days, was thought cruel and severe, namely, decimation; but, whereas the most bloodthirsty Consul would have contented himself with twenty out of 200 mutineers, the Turks require 10,000 innocent persons for 200 rebels, or fifty times as many. On May 11th, 1876, Prince Gortschakoff and Count Andrassy met Prince Bismarck in Berlin, and then was framed the Berlin Memorandum. In brief and peremptory words it stated that, as the Sultan had given the Powers a pledge to execute the reforms specified in the Andrassy Note, he had at the same time given them a moral right to insist that he should keep his word. The Christians could not trust the promises of the Turks. "It is most essential, therefore," said the Note, "to establish certain guarantees of a nature to ensure beyond doubt the loyal and full application of the measures agreed upon between the Powers and the Porte."

The recommendations of the Berlin Memorandum were—an armistice of two months to afford time for negotiations between the Porte and the Bosnian and Herzegovinian delegates, the following points being taken as the basis of discussion: (1) That materials for the reconstruction of the houses and churches destroyed during the insurrection shall be furnished to the returning refugees, and that their subsistence shall be assured to them until such time as they are in a position to earn their own livelihood. (2) As far as the distribution of relief depends upon the Turkish Commissary, that official is to consult as to the measures to be taken with the mixed Commission mentioned in the Note of December 30th, so as to guarantee the faithful application of the reforms, and to control their execution —the Commission to consist of natives representing the two reli-

gions of the country, and to be presided over by a Herzegovinian Christian. (3) To avert collision, advice is to be given to Constantinople to concentrate the Turkish troops at points to be agreed upon, at any rate until excitement has subsided. (4) The Christians to retain their arms as well as the Mussulmans. (5) The Consuls or delegates of the Powers to preside over the application of the reforms in general, and of the measures of repatriation in particular. Lastly came the all-important addition that, if the armistice expired without the objects of the Powers being attained, "the three Imperial Courts are of opinion that it will become necessary to reinforce diplomatic action by the sanction of an understanding with a view to those efficacious measures which would appear to be demanded in the interest of general peace to arrest the mischief and prevent its further development." France and Italy agreed to support the Note, and urged the English Government to follow the same course. On May 19th, however, Lord Derby intimated to Lord Odo Russell that the Government *declined to accept a plan in the preparation of which it had not been consulted*, and which it did not believe would succeed. Lord Derby even refused to press the Porte to grant a two months' armistice.

Nothing could be more moderate and satisfactory than the Berlin Memorandum, and it will be seen that Lord Derby did not refuse to support it, as the Government now say, because it meant coercion, but because their vanity was piqued at not being consulted in its preparation, and of course no plan which these Solons had not contrived could possibly succeed. France and Italy cordially consented to the Berlin Memorandum, and, therefore, did contemplate contingent coercion, whilst our Government said they did not agree to the Memorandum; and thus we were the first and only nation to introduce discord into the European concert by insisting on playing too many eccentric solos, and becoming offended at the same supposed neglect which gave no offence whatever either to France or Italy, though France might naturally be supposed to be more apt to detect or imagine a slight from Germany than ourselves; and why should England take

the huff at not being consulted about the preparation of the Berlin Memorandum, when she was not consulted previously about the preparation of the Andrassy Note?

On the 30th of June Servia chivalrously announced that she intended to join her arms to those of Bosnia and Herzegovina to secure the liberation of its kindred Christians from the yoke of the Porte. "Our movement," said Prince Milan, "is purely national. It excludes every element of social revolution and religious fanaticism. We do not carry with us revolution, fire, and destruction, but right, order, and security." The French actually wished that the Powers should join in restraining Servia from going to war, as if this would not have been an infringement of the phantom independence of Turkey; but as the other Powers wisely refused, the proposal was dropped, and Sir H. Elliott expressed a fervent wish that the Servians might be defeated.

Fighting against such enormous odds, though aided by only about 4,000 Russian volunteers, according to the reliable authority of Mr. Mackenzie Wallace, the Servians, after gaining some advantages, sustained such reverses that on the 24th of July Prince Milan summoned the Consuls of the Powers in Belgrade to the palace and intimated his willingness to accept the intervention of the Powers for the purpose of bringing about a cessation of hostilities.

On September 1st England proposed that there should be an armistice for a month. The Porte declined to grant an armistice, but had the effrontery to propose peace on the following outrageous terms: (1) That Prince Milan should do homage to the Sultan in Constantinople (whether by kissing his toe or licking the dust upon his feet is not stated); that four of the Servian fortresses should be garrisoned by Turkish troops; that the number of the Servian fortresses should be limited; that Servia should pay either an indemnity or a larger tribute; and that the Porte should have a right to construct and work a railway through the Principalities. These demands were declared to be inadmissible by the Powers, who declared in favour of the *status quo ante bellum*, but the customary amount of foolish arrogance on the part of the

Turks was enhanced by the circumstance that Sultan Murad was insane, and had to be deposed.

On September 16th, the Porte agreed to a suspension of hostilities till the 25th, and meantime Prince Milan was proclaimed King at Deligrad; nevertheless, Turkey agreed to prolong the truce till October 2nd, but as Servia considered a mere suspension injurious, hostilities were resumed, and, unfortunately, Servia in five days was defeated by overwhelming forces and a superior artillery. Russia then demanded an armistice of a month or six weeks, on which the Porte proposed that which in the preceding month she scornfully refused to grant when humbly solicited by her obsequious friend, England, and eagerly offered an armistice of four times the duration which Russia, its hereditary enemy, demanded. Russia refused to agree to so long a term, and though our Russophobists pretend that she was afraid or unable to go to war, she boldly sent Turkey an ultimatum on October 31st, and the Porte at once ate the leek and surrendered at discretion on this important point.

On September 26th, Russia informed England that in its opinion force should be used to stop the war and put an end to Turkish misrule. The Czar proposed that Bulgaria should be occupied by Russian troops, that Bosnia should be occupied by Austrian soldiers, and that the united fleets of the Powers should enter the Bosphorus. The Czar was willing to abandon the idea of any occupation, "if the naval demonstration were considered sufficient by Her Majesty's Government."

On October 3rd, Lord Derby intimated that the Cabinet would propose an armistice of not less than one month, but that it would not support the plan of an armed demonstration. England then, which had considered an armistice of a month sufficient, immediately bowed to the superior judgment of Turkey, and accepted the six months' truce, in which she was followed by France, Austria, and Germany; but Prince Gortschakoff pointed out that Russia could not ask Servia to accept so long an armistice, because the Principality could not keep its army on the war footing for such a length of time without putting too severe a

strain on its resources; hence Russia insisted that the armistice should not exceed six weeks, and in this policy Italy agreed.

It is obvious that, if this proposal of Russia had been accepted by England, all the other Powers would have acquiesced, and the war would have been avoided. An English and French squadron, when England was under a Liberal Government, on the occasion of the massacres in Syria, had successfully used coercion and compelled the reluctant Turks to submit to a French occupation of the province, and I append the very words which Safvet Pasha made use of on that occasion: "It is owing to the counsels of the representatives of the Powers, and the vision held out to us of foreign troops landing on our territories, notwithstanding the refusal which we should have given to the conclusion of the Convention, that we have been reduced to choose the lesser of two evils." It is also notorious that Admiral Duckworth's squadron in 1806, after forcing the Dardanelles, might have captured Constantinople and put an end to the Turkish Empire if he had threatened an immediate attack; and Austria had in 1853 sent a peremptory ultimatum to Turkey demanding concessions to Montenegro, which was instantly swallowed by the Turks; so that experience shows that the Porte will always submit to the imperative demands of any one of the great Powers but Russia; and she only sometimes dares to refuse Russia, because she knows that England has an inveterate prejudice against that country and in her favour.

On November 2nd, the Czar, at an interview with the English Ambassador at Livadia, said "he pledged his sacred word and honour in the most earnest and solemn manner, that he had no intention of acquiring Constantinople, and that, if necessity should oblige him to occupy a portion of Bulgaria, it would only be provisionally, and until the peace and safety of the Christian population could be secured." The Czar earnestly requested the Ambassador to do his utmost to dispel the cloud of suspicion and distrust of Russia which had gathered in England. Next day Lord Derby telegraphed to Lord A. Loftus that the Cabinet had received the assurances of His Majesty with the

greatest satisfaction. Yet on November 9th, at the Lord Mayor's banquet, Lord Beaconsfield made a braggadocio threatening and insulting speech respecting Russia, studiously concealing the conciliatory assurances of the Czar from the British public. No wonder the Czar was irritated at such disgraceful and disingenuous conduct, and at the implication that his most sacred word of honour could not be trusted and that England defied him; consequently next day, at Moscow, he expressed a hope that the Conference at Constantinople which England had suggested would bring peace, and he added, "Should this, however, not be achieved, and should I see that we cannot obtain such guarantees as are necessary for carrying out what we have a right to demand of the Porte, I am firmly determined to act independently, and I am convinced that in this case the whole of Russia will respond to my summons should I consider it necessary, and should the honour of Russia require it;" and the Czar, finding that up to November 21st the English Government had withheld for their own purposes his conciliatory conversation with our Ambassador from the British public and the world, at last succeeded on that evening in extorting its publication.

It seems to me clear that Lord Beaconsfield's intemperate and insolent speech at the Guildhall, which necessarily entailed the Czar's declaration at Moscow, was one of the chief causes of the war, for after that declaration was thus provoked by a studied insult and the suppression of a conciliatory conversation, the Czar bound himself, without that amount of delay which might otherwise have been possible, to go to war with Turkey if the Conference failed. The chief instructions to Lord Salisbury for the Conference were "that the Porte should simultaneously undertake, in a protocol to be signed at Constantinople with the representatives of the mediating Powers, to grant to Bosnia and Herzegovina a system of local or administrative autonomy; by which is to be understood a system of local institutions which shall give the population some control over their own local affairs, and guarantees against the exercise of arbitrary authority. *There is to be no question of a tributary state.* Guarantees of a similar kind to be also

provided against maladministration in Bulgaria. . . . These bases have generally been accepted by the other Powers." Lord Stratford had, however, recommended that these provinces should be made into tributary states, but the Government was in that respect even more Turkish than Lord Stratford. To exonerate, however, "the Eltchi," as he is called in Kinglake's work, of the, to him, distressing charge of being on the whole a whit less Turkish even than the Turks, I may quote the following sentence from a speech of his: "Should any aggression be made on the territories or national independence of Turkey, we could not in honour reject the appeal which would doubtless be made to our good faith, even if it were to involve us in hostilities with an aggressive Power, or an aggressive coalition:" so that, according to this "English Sultan," we are bound in honour to fight, not only Russia, but Austria and Prussia, in fact all the powers of the world, if they violated the independence or integrity of Turkey. Four days later Lord Derby wrote another dispatch about the Bulgarian atrocities asking for redress; but the blood-stained butcher responsible for the worst of the excesses, Chefket Pasha, was still at large, and, as it was said, defying the agents of the law to interfere with him, as "he had in his pocket the evidence that whatever was done in Bulgaria was simply in compliance with the order of the Government;" and as he has not even yet been punished, but has been rewarded, and is now in command of the left wing of the Turkish army of Asia, it is as clear as that two and two make four that the Turkish Government ordered the Bulgarian massacres.

When Lord Salisbury visited Berlin on his way to Constantinople, the Emperor of Germany told him that "the course taken by the Emperor Alexander had been imposed upon him by circumstances, and that the promises of the Porte could no longer be accepted;" so that, though the English Government pretend the contrary, it is clear that the Emperor of Germany thoroughly approved of the Moscow declaration, and thought that, if no sufficient redress was obtained for the Christians of Turkey at the Conference, the Czar was not only entitled but bound to coerce Turkey.

At the meeting of the Conference on December 22nd, Safvet Pasha, with even more than the ordinary amount of Turkish falsehood and audacity, had the assurance to say, as to the Bulgarian massacres, "If the vast scale on which the conspiracy was organised is taken into consideration, along with the numerous means of action of which it was able to dispose, and the circumstances extraordinarily unfavourable for the Imperial Government in the midst of which it burst forth, one will be astonished that an insurrection which had for its object to convert all the peninsula of the Balkans into a great field of carnage, could have been suppressed and completely brought to nothing in so short a time, and without there being more sacrifices to deplore." If this outrageous misrepresentation had been really credited by the ignorant Turks, of course Lord Derby's dispatch of September was an unjustifiable insult, and would have warranted the Porte in going to war with us if it was not withdrawn with an ample apology; but, fortunately, the ferocious Turk tempers justice with mercy, and (though we are only infidel dogs) will not too severely punish a poor old ally like England merely for an angry dispatch.

At Rome the Italian Minister, M. Melegari, told Lord Salisbury that "the action of the Powers ought not to be derived from or limited by the Treaty of Paris, but that their functions were rather those of mediators, deriving their title solely from the events of the war and the acceptance of the Conference by the Porte."

M. Melegari stated (30th December, 1876):—"The Powers should not be limited in seeking for solutions to the questions which will be submitted to the Conference by the obligations of the Treaty of Paris, and he cannot admit that the Porte is free to refuse the decisions which the Conference may adopt."

As the Turks resisted all concessions, the representatives of the Powers ignominiously attenuated their proposals, and when it was pointed out that some of the propositions which the Turks declined were identical with those in the Andrassy Note, both Safvet Pasha and Edhem Pasha declared that they had never even read that Note. So much for the knowledge and intelligence of Turkish ministers. The Conference, however, most obligingly

did not insist that the Turks should even grant the inadequate concessions of the Andrassy Note. They suggested an occupation of the disturbed provinces by Belgian soldiers, but Belgium refused to send them, and the Porte to receive them. Then it was suggested that the Turkish troops in Bulgaria should be confined to fortified places and certain large towns, and that order should be kept by a National Guard, composed of Christians and Mussulmans, and virtually placed under the command of the Governor-General. These demands were abandoned. The Conference had further claimed that the necessary reforms should be executed by an International Commission, which should have at its command a special gendarmerie, composed partly of Europeans and partly of Turks. The military part of that stipulation was also abandoned. Finally, the Conference was content to demand that the first governors of Bosnia and Bulgaria should be appointed with the consent of the Powers, and that the Powers should be allowed to form an International Commission, which should, however, have no military means of executing its own decrees. The Conference might fairly have demanded that the provinces of Bulgaria, Herzegovina, and Bosnia should at least have an autonomy equal to that of the Lebanon, where there is a Christian governor, a local police, and no Turkish troops permitted within its bounds. Every suggestion of material guarantees had vanished; yet, on the 18th, the Grand Council of the Porte peremptorily rejected even these slight and utterly inadequate demands, which were far less irksome to Turkey than those to which she had consented on the occasion of the French occupation of Syria, and on many other occasions, and than the terms indicated in the Andrassy Note, to which the Porte not only assented, but pressed reluctant England to adopt; and on the following day Safvet Pasha signified that decision to the final meeting of the Ambassadors; and on this, as a mark of the displeasure of the Powers, all their Ambassadors were withdrawn from Constantinople, but the Turks, according to their wont, pocketed this affront, and did not, as is the invariable practice in civilised countries, withdraw their Ambassadors from the Courts of the Powers,

It is obvious that, as the Porte agreed to the Conference, she was bound by its decision, unless, indeed, she could prove that bribery, coercion, or other unfair means had been used to influence it. No lawyer or other man of business in England will accept a reference unless the parties bind themselves beforehand to abide by his decision without appeal, and it was most discreditable and undignified for England to propose or accept a Conference on any other terms. The concessions made by the Powers to Turkish arrogance were equally humiliating and useless; and I think Russia especially went too far in allowing the conditions to be attenuated to such a degree that they were ludicrously inadequate to the purpose, in deference to the wishes of the Powers, and especially of England.

England, however, was the sole cause of the failure of the Conference, by openly, unnecessarily, and ostentatiously proclaiming that she would be no party to contingent coercion; and, even if the English Cabinet thought coercion injudicious, they should have refrained from stating their views on that question till after the Conference. Would any member of the present Cabinet, if he had a claim against an individual, tell his opponent that if he resisted that claim he would not enforce it? and, if such conduct would be considered silly in an individual, how much more idiotic and reprehensible is it in a Government? It is notorious that Lord Beaconsfield is the heart and soul of the Turkish party in the Cabinet, that he contrived this predetermined *fiasco*, and it may be said, to quote a familiar text, "Benjamin's* *mess* was five times so great as that of any of the 'others" in the burgling of the British Cabinet.

The Conference having proved abortive, as every man of sense foresaw, Russia asked the Powers what they proposed to do, but before they had replied, she invited them to wait for the communication of a Protocol which she was preparing.

By that Protocol, Russia of its own accord (conditionally) agreed to dispense with guarantees for the amelioration of the condition of the Christians for an indefinite period, and to trust to the promises of the Sultan, but it concludes by these words: "If the

* Lord Beaconsfield's (Christian or Jewish?) name is Benjamin.

condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte should not be improved in a manner to prevent the return of the complications which periodically disturb the peace of the East, they think it right to declare that such a state of affairs would be incompatible with their interests, and those of Europe in general. In such case they reserve to themselves to consider in common as to the means which they may deem best fitted to secure the well-being of the Christian populations and the interests of the general peace." This judicious Protocol was very willingly signed by the Ambassadors of all the Powers, except Lord Derby, who signed it reluctantly and ungraciously, and who added a declaration which rendered it abortive, and which the other Powers did not agree to sign. In this, again, the English Government showed themselves more Turkish than the Turks, for the Sultan said to Sir H. Elliott (see despatch, October 7th, 1876), "Let the European Powers give me time to carry out the measures upon which I am determined, and, if at the end of a fixed period I should be found not to have done so, I shall be ready to submit to their dictation;" whilst the English Ministry would not promise to use coercion at any future period, however remote. Italy, however, made the following declaration: "Italy is only bound by the signature of the Protocol of this day's date, so long as the agreement happily established between all the Powers by the Declaration itself is maintained." The terms of the Protocol are as follows: "Inasmuch as it is solely in the interests of European peace that her Britannic Majesty's Government have consented to sign the Protocol proposed by that of Russia, it is understood beforehand that in the event of the object proposed not being attained, namely, reciprocal disarmament on the part of Russia and Turkey, and peace between them, the Protocol in question shall be considered null and void;" and on the same day, 31st March, 1877, the Ambassadors of all the Powers being present, Russia made the following declaration: "If peace with Montenegro is concluded, and the Porte accepts the advice of Europe, and shows itself ready to replace its forces on a peace footing, and seriously to undertake the reforms mentioned in the

Protocol, let it send to St. Petersburg a Special Envoy to treat of disarmament, to which his Majesty the Emperor would also consent. If massacres similar to those which have occurred in Bulgaria take place, this would necessarily put a stop to the measures of demobilization."

It has been objected to the Russian declaration that it was derogatory to the Porte to send an Envoy to St. Petersburg to treat about disarmament, but as Russia had allowed the Conference to take place at Constantinople, where, according to a member of the Grand Council, the Russian Ambassador had been obliged to leave in consequence of the glorious answer of Turkey to the "demands of the whole lot" of the Powers, it was manifestly impossible for Russia to risk being exposed to that indignity a second time, and it was, besides, the turn of St. Petersburg to be the place for this second negotiation; and so little did the Turks consider sending an Ambassador to Russia to treat for disarmament derogatory, that Musurus Pasha told Lord Derby he had telegraphed to Constantinople strongly urging the expediency of this step.

Thus England again broke away from the European concert, and no Power intimated its disapproval of the Russian declaration. Though the Protocol was signed on the 31st of March, yet on the 4th of April, Russia was obliged to complain that England delayed to join in its presentation to the Porte, although the armistice had only another week to run.

Lord Derby, on the 5th of April, in a dispatch to Mr. Jocelyn, committed himself to the following opinion, which is totally at variance with what he says in his last unjust and insulting dispatch to Prince Gortschakoff: "Her Majesty's Government consider that the Protocol, *taken in conjunction with the declaration made on behalf of Russia* by Count Schouvaloff, gives an opportunity for the arrangement of a mutual disarmament by Russia and Turkey, of which the latter ought on every account to avail herself."

Before the Porte received the Protocol, Mr. Jocelyn wrote a dispatch, on the 3rd of April, to Lord Derby, which shows that

the mutual demobilization on which England so strenuously insisted would have been an unwise and dangerous measure: "It has evidently come to the knowledge of the Porte that some clause exists in the Protocol, or in the Declaration, menacing cessation of the disarmament of Russia in presence of any disturbance involving outrage upon Christians, and they cannot conceal from themselves the fact that such acts of violence are not unlikely to occur during the demobilization of their own army. They are well aware that thousands of men, to whom from six to thirty-three months' arrears of pay will remain due—many of them called under arms at a cruel sacrifice to their domestic happiness and their agricultural prospects—will be sent home starving and uncared for, and will, moreover, be certain to come into contact with portions of the Christian populations on the way to their homes. It is not difficult to see what may be the deplorable consequences of such a state of things."

We have next the dispatch of Lord Derby to Mr. Jocelyn, on the 9th of April, in which he says that the Turkish Ambassador had informed him "that the Porte felt that the contents of the Protocol were derogatory to the Sultan's dignity and independence, and that, rather than accede to its provisions, it would be better for Turkey to face the alternative of war, even of an unsuccessful war, resulting in the loss of one or two provinces." Lord Derby observed in reply, that "so far from the question being one merely of the loss of a province or two, it seemed to him to be a matter for apprehension whether at the close of the conflict the Ottoman Empire would still be in existence." From this it seems logically to flow that the Government will not go to war with Russia for Constantinople, or any other portion of the Ottoman dominion, to retain the sovereignty of the Turks, unless, indeed, certain portions in which British interests are supposed to be involved are annexed by Russia, instead of being made independent or handed over to other Powers, such as the kingdom of Greece.

"As Musurus Pasha spoke of the Turks retiring into Asia, if compelled, and maintaining there their independence of rule,

I asked him whether he meant seriously to contend that it would be better, in the interests of the Porte, that the Turks should be driven out of Europe than that the Sultan's Government should tacitly acquiesce in a document to which they were not required or requested to give any formal and express assent, which had been drawn up and signed without their being consulted, for which, therefore, they were in no way responsible, and which, after all, called upon the Porte, as I understood its tenor, to do no more than it had either already expressed itself ready to do, or than it might be presumed to be willing to do, with a view to the well-being and security of Turkey." Musurus Pasha replied that "the Protocol was a virtual abrogation of the 9th article of the Treaty of Paris; that to allow it to pass in silence would, in the opinion of the Porte, be to surrender all that Turkey had fought for in regard to the Sultan's freedom from foreign intervention, and that this was a humiliation to which his Government would not at any risk submit." There is no doubt that the Protocol was an infraction of the Treaty of Paris, but so was the September dispatch, and so was the action of the French and German Governments in landing a force at Salonica on the occasion of the murder of their Consuls; so that, when Lord Derby taxes Russia with violating the Treaty of Paris, he should recollect that we were the first to break it on the occasion of the coercion used by us in the case of the Syrian massacres, and that people in glass houses should not throw stones.

On April 6th, Prince Gortschakoff told the English Ambassador that Russia did not require Turkey to accept the Protocol, but the conditions of the Declaration, and he expressed his regret that England had communicated her declaration to the Porte, as it would encourage its resistance to the Protocol and the Russian Declaration. The communication of the English Declaration was another illustration of the imbecility of the conduct of the Government, and made the rejection of the Protocol and Russian Declaration absolutely certain; it was like playing a game of ecarté with your own cards faced whilst your adversary's cards are concealed. The Russian Minister told Lord A. Loftus that the

mobilization cost his country at the rate of upwards of £40,000,000 a year, and it was all very well for us to talk of delay who are much richer and yet had not this grievous burden; and consequently Russia's patience at this rate for the preceding six months, to meet England's wishes, must have cost about £20,000,000, or as much as the whole sum which we are so proud of having given to emancipate the negroes in the West Indies.

Prince Gortschakoff further said that Turkey must give a favourable decision by the 13th of April, or else Russia would declare war; but if Lord Derby considered that, if Russia carried out this threat, she would violate the Treaty of Paris, break up the European concert, and do injustice to Turkey by not giving her time for those reforms in which the English Government had previously said they had no faith—if they had recanted that opinion, why did he not at once warn Russia, instead of waiting till Russia had taken the irrevocable step of declaring war and then writing her an insulting and unjust dispatch?

On April 12th, Lord Derby received the Turkish communication, definitely refusing to submit to the Protocol or Russian Declaration, and much of which I have already related as having passed between Lord Derby and Musurus Pasha. The Turks said, "The Imperial Government is prepared to replace its armies on a peace footing *as soon as it sees that the Russian Government* is taking measures of a similar character;" so that Turkey actually required that, instead of the simultaneous disarmament proposed by England, Russia should disarm first, which was obviously ridiculous and unfair. The dispatch proceeds to say that Turkey "believes that Europe is convinced that the disorders which have disturbed the tranquillity of the provinces were due to external pressure, that the Imperial Government cannot be held responsible for them, and that, consequently, the Russian Government would not be justified in making the demobilization of its armies depend on such contingencies." Now, this was a deliberate falsehood, for Safvet Pasha, who framed the dispatch, had heard the Ambassadors of all the Powers lay

the blame of the massacres on the Turkish Government, and even at his own packed Grand Council, Rifaat Bey said, "It should be remembered that public opinion is against us in all Europe;" and it was absurd to suppose that, if a general massacre of the Christians commenced, Russia would begin or continue to demobilize. In a succeeding sentence the dispatch does not say whether Turkey would or would not send an Ambassador to St. Petersburg, but has recourse to equivocation, and coolly suggests that Russia should telegraph to direct a disarmament without arranging any conditions with Turkey, or obtaining any pledge of simultaneous disarmament. In a subsequent passage it is said that the last part of the Protocol, which I have already quoted, "must provoke the legitimate protestations of the Imperial Government, and encounter its most formal opposition. Turkey, as an independent State, cannot submit to be placed under any surveillance, whether collective or not. The Treaty of Paris explicitly declared the principle of non-intervention; that Treaty which binds the other high contracting parties as well, cannot be abolished by a Protocol in which Turkey has taken no part." The Turks seem to hold that all clauses which are advantageous to them are eternally binding, whilst they may violate those they do not like with impunity, and without superseding the Treaty. Instead of performing its promises of justice to the Christians, Turkey has indulged itself with frequent periodical battues, in which thousands of Christians have been massacred, and the Treaty of Paris, as regards Turkey, is waste paper.

On the same day Lord Derby wrote to Mr. Jocelyn to say that he had received the Turkish dispatch, and regretted the view which the Porte took of the Protocol and Declarations, but that it was unnecessary to discuss a step "adopted by the Porte after full consideration, and which could not now be retraced. I said, however, that it did not seem to me clear . . . whether the Porte would or would not consent to send an Ambassador to St. Petersburg to treat on the question of mutual disarmament. . . . Musurus Pasha stated that his Government were not prepared to adopt any such measure, and he further expressed an opinion that

matters could not be settled in a satisfactory manner unless the Powers consented to annul the Protocol;" and the force of arrogance could no further go than to suppose that all the Powers of Europe, at the bidding of barbarous, ignorant, and stupid Turkey, would withdraw a document which they had all deliberately signed.

Lord Derby then said, "The divergence between the views of our two Governments appeared so wide as to render discussion useless, and I said I did not see what further steps Her Majesty's Government could take to avert a war which appeared to have become inevitable." But, if he saw it was inevitable, how came he to express surprise and concern in the insulting dispatch which he wrote to Prince Gortschakoff on the declaration of war? and how could it be necessary for England to write such a dispatch or any dispatch at all, when none of the other Powers thought it necessary to do so?

It is thus abundantly clear that it was the vacillating conduct of England that is the chief cause of the present war between Russia and Turkey.

The next step in their negotiations was the dispatch of Prince Gortschakoff of April 7th, 1877, the most important passages of which are as follows:—"The Protocol signed in London on the 19th March of this year was the last expression of the collective will of Europe. The Imperial Cabinet had suggested it as a supreme effort of conciliation. . . . *The Porte has just answered by a fresh refusal. This eventuality had not been contemplated by the Protocol of London.* . . . This document had confined itself to stipulating that, in case the great Powers were deceived in their hope of seeing the Porte energetically apply the measures destined to afford to the condition of the Christian population the improvement unanimously called for as indispensable to the tranquillity of Europe, they reserved to themselves to consider in common as to the means which they might deem best fitted to secure the well-being of those populations and the interest of the general peace. *Thus, the Cabinet had foreseen the case of the Porte not fulfilling the promises it might have made, but not that of its rejecting the demands of Europe.* . . . The refusal of the Porte, and the reason on

which it is founded, leave no hope of deference on its part to the wishes and counsels of Europe, and no guarantee for the application of the reforms suggested for the improvement of the Christian population. . . . *In circumstances every chance is closed for efforts of conciliation.* There remains no alternative but to allow the state of things to continue which the Powers have declared incompatible with their interests and those of Europe in general, or else to seek to obtain by coercion what the unanimous efforts of the Cabinet have not succeeded in obtaining from the Porte by persuasion. Our august Master has resolved to undertake this work. *In assuming this task, our august Master fulfils a duty imposed upon him in the interest of Russia, whose peaceful development is hindered by this permanent disturbance in the East.* His Imperial Majesty has the conviction that he responds at the same time to the sentiments and interests of Europe."

Lord Derby answered on May 1st:—"The Protocol . . . required from the Sultan no fresh guarantees for the reform of his administration. . . . Her Majesty's Government cannot, therefore, admit . . . . that the answer of the Porte removed all hope of deference on its part to the wishes and advice of Europe, and all security for the application of the suggested reforms. . . . They have not concealed their feeling that the presence of large Russian forces on the frontiers of Turkey, menacing its safety, rendered disarmament impossible, and exciting a feeling of apprehension and fanaticism among the Mussulman population, constituted a natural obstacle to internal purification and reform. They cannot believe that the continuance of these armies on Turkish soil will alleviate the difficulty or improve the condition of the Christian population. . . . . In the Conference of London in 1871 . . . . Russia signed a declaration affirming it to be an essential principle of the law of nations that no Power can liberate itself from the engagement of a Treaty, nor nullify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the co-treating parties by means of an amicable arrangement. In taking action against Turkey on his own part, and having

recourse to arms without further consultation with his allies, the Emperor of Russia has separated himself from the European concert hitherto maintained, and has at the same time departed from the rule to which he himself had solemnly recorded his consent. It is impossible to foresee the consequence of such an act, and the Government feel bound to state, in a manner equally formal and public, that the decision of the Russian Government is not one which can have their concurrence or approval."

This dispatch of Prince Gortschakoff's is as able, logical, and courteous as that of Lord Derby is confused, inconsistent, and insulting.

Russia points out that the refusal of the Protocol was an eventuality which none of the Powers had foreseen, and this fact, even if it stood alone, clearly stamps the action of the Porte with the emphatic condemnation of Europe; since, if it was wrong to break promises which they expected the Porte to make of doing justice to the Christians, it was still worse to refuse even to promise justice to them; and while most probably they would, with their usual bad faith, have broken these promises, it is quite certain that they would not be better than their word, and fulfil duties that they had not even promised to perform. It is quite evident that the other Powers of Europe agree with Prince Gortschakoff that Russia was compelled, both in the interests of the Christians of Turkey and for her own protection, not to delay any longer in going to war, as silence gives consent; and not one of the other Powers has even yet followed the pernicious example of England by sending any reply whatever to such self-evident propositions, still less by sending an insulting, or even a cold, reserved, or doubtful answer.

Many of even their own most consistent followers strongly disapprove of Lord Derby's dispatch; for instance, the Duke of Rutland, who expressed his regret at the strong terms in which the dispatch of 1st of May was drawn up. "He thought it most important that this country should be acting in concert with the rest of Europe for the maintenance of a strict neutrality, but he understood that the document he referred to had created the

greatest consternation in foreign countries. It blamed Russia for breaking the Treaty of 1856. But he denied that the statement was correct, for at the conference, and during the drawing up of the protocol afterwards, Russia went to the utmost extent possible to meet the wishes of the Powers, and he thought therefore that Russia was justified in saying that she would fulfil the duties imposed by the Treaty of Paris. He added that the Government ought to be grateful to Mr. Gladstone for the part he took in telling them he knew the feeling of the country on the subject." Government say that if they had not answered this dispatch then, silence would have implied consent, therefore it conclusively follows that the silence of all the other powers implies their full assent.

Besides the duty imposed specially on Russia of protecting its co-religionists and fellow Slavonians, Prince Gortschakoff points out that the war is also necessary for the interest of Russia, whose peaceful development is hindered by the permanent disturbances in the East.

La Rochefoucauld cynically said that few things give us so much pleasure as the misfortunes of our best friends, and naturally the Philo-Turks in the Cabinet still more rejoice in the evils sustained by their hated enemies, the Russians. Our rival's house is on fire, but we bear it with exemplary philosophy.

Lord Derby practically says England is in no hurry, and is willing to wait an indefinite time for justice to the Christians and the pacification of the East of Europe, which she knows by the past twenty years' experience will not, and cannot, take place without coercion, since equal justice to the Christians, as Freeman points out, is contrary to the Mussulman religion.

It is true that England said, at the Conference, that the Russian army was the only hope of the Powers obtaining satisfactory guarantees. We now eat our words, and say the contrary, namely, "that the presence of large Russian forces on the frontiers of Turkey, menacing its safety, rendered disarmament impossible;" yet we made this impossible condition a *sine quâ non* for our adhering to the Protocol. The force of inconsistency and absurdity could surely go no further. Lord Derby cannot believe that "the

entrance of the Russian armies on Turkish soil will alleviate the difficulty or improve the condition of the Christian population." The scepticism of Lord Derby is, perhaps, even more absurd than his credulity, for every sane man must see that when the Russian armies arrive in Bulgaria and the other oppressed districts, the Christians will no longer have anything to fear; and as Russia left behind her after the Crimea the liberties of the Principalities, in spite of the English policy of subjecting them to Turkey, she will certainly not be less magnanimous to the other Christian populations of Turkey.

Suppose Catholic and French-speaking Belgium was still oppressed by Protestant and Dutch-speaking Holland, and was in continual insurrection, would France tolerate an insulting dispatch from Russia, accusing her of violating treaties, breaking up the European concert, and disregarding its own solemn promises, if, after two years' patience, the other Powers declined to interfere, and she, therefore, went to war with Holland to protect her co-religionists the kindred people of Belgium? Besides, Lord Derby said this year that treaties were no longer binding when circumstances had changed; and does he now mean to say that there has been no change in the circumstances since the Treaty of Paris, when he has so oftentimes said the contrary?

Lord Derby had expressly told Turkey, as I have already shown, that if she did not accept the Protocol it was certain that Russia would go to war; and yet he affects surprise that she has done the very thing which he foretold. If, in the meantime, this weathercock or chameleon of a Foreign Secretary had changed his mind, why did he not warn Russia before the declaration of war that, if she did attack Turkey, he would, after all, on re-consideration, consider it a violation of treaties and a culpable departure from the European concert, in which case possibly Russia might have waited to obtain a decision of the majority of the Powers on this point, when I have no doubt whatever that she would have been adjudged to be in the right and England in the wrong.

That the English public may judge how the dispatch of Lord Derby is viewed in Russia, and that you cannot insult a great

nation with impunity, I append the following extract from a long article in the *Grajdavine* of St. Petersburg :—

"After shedding our blood for the Slavonians, we are expected, no matter whether victors or vanquished, to subordinate ourselves to the London and Vienna governments. . . . In a word, when the Russian soldier has served long enough as food for the Turkish cannon, peace may be concluded on the terms of the disgraceful Constantinople Conference, a Conference which, as we know from the confessions of European diplomacy, was England's way of befooling Russia. . . . If anything is to be done in the way of improving the condition of the Slav in Turkey, it is to be done by England. Having committed the signal mistake of declaring war, Russia, it would seem, ought to apologise to England, and to stop operations the moment England, Austria, and Turkey demand it. . . . During the war we are to act as fools and jesters for the entertainment of the Anglo-Austrians; after the war to behave as cowards and poltroons. . . . Is it for this that Russia has existed this thousand years? . . . The contempt for our Russian aspirations expressed in the Andrassy Memorandum, the Berlin Protocol, the Constantinople Conference, and the London Protocol, and last, not least, in the *brutality* of England's final note to this government—a brutality which took all the world by surprise—all this is nothing in comparison to the scorn cast upon us at a moment of enthusiastic devotion to the sacred work in hand. There is no exaggeration in this. Even after the Note of the London to the St. Petersburg cabinet—a Note the scornful tone of which offended not only the Russian Czar and people, but violated the time-honoured traditions of European diplomacy—our diplomatic representatives abroad preserved a calm and indifferent attitude. There was no sign they resented the blow they had received. . . . All this is the more provoking, as the foreigners expect us to recognise our inferiority to the rest of Europe. Europe is a palace tenanted by noble lords and gentlemen; the Russians' place is in the ante-room. If England and Austria are so eager to restore peace, it is because they discover their inability to stop us. As to their threats, they are a

vain boast and no more. While they fancied Russia unable to go to war, they played the double game of insulting our sovereign and of turning his moderate and pacific sentiments to account. Is it possible that we again fall into this abominable trap?"

Russia may submit to this and a few other insults for a while; but if she is too much provoked, she will inevitably be compelled to withdraw her ambassador from England, as the Emperor Nicholas did previously to the Crimean War, and to send his passports to ours.

As Turkey has—thanks to the silly English bondholders—the command of the sea, Russia has very little to fear if we oblige her to go to war with us by persisting in studied insults and gross injustice, such as threatening her if she exercises her just belligerent rights against Egypt, or attacks any locality where we think British interests are involved.

Sebastopol is already destroyed, at a cost of 75 millions, whilst the Russians might very well have agreed to destroy it themselves for a third of the money, which would probably have rebuilt it afterwards and left an ample margin; and there is no other considerable naval arsenal which we could attack with any prospect of success, since, even when we had the French and Turkish fleets to support us, we could do very little injury to Russia, either in the Baltic or the Black Sea, except at Sebastopol, during the Crimean War; and as to a military expedition without France, it would be altogether preposterous.

The next move on the political chess-board was the intimation sent by Lord Derby to Russia about Egyyt, and also to Turkey—another violation of the independence of that State and of the Treaty of Paris—that "England would regard an attempt to blockade, or otherwise to interfere with the Canal or its approaches, as a menace to India, and as a grave injury to the commerce of the world." Yet the Government, in answer to Sir W. Harcourt, said "The Cabinet has no wish to prescribe the particular limitations which either belligerent Power shall place on its rights." Now I conceive if we tell Russia that we will go to war with her if she attacks the Canal, the purchase of which Mrs. Thistlethwayte recommended some years ago, we are bound in

honour, and to prevent Russia from unintentionally involving herself in war with us, to state clearly and distinctly how far she may go without menacing India or injuring the commerce of the world. Our contention is manifestly absurd, for supposing a Russian man-of-war entered the Canal to pass through, according to our dictum, the Turks may not capture it by an attack of their land forces; and if it is protected, Russia is being helped against Turkey. Suppose, too, that Russia was as malicious as Philo-Turks pretend, she has only to send a number of old merchantmen into the Canal loaded with enormous blocks of stone, and to sink them by a pretended accident, and then the commerce of the world is as effectually stopped as if she took possession of the Canal, and then, contrary to the rights of nations and her own interests, shut it up.

Whilst the Russians have agreed to comply with our wishes, the Turks, it is understood, have stated that they would attack any Russian vessel in the Canal, but of course we shall as usual submit to the decision of Turkey.

I defy any one to show that even the occupation of the whole of Egypt, and the stoppage of the Suez Canal, would be a menace to India, even if Russia went to war with us, since Russia could not attack India from Egypt, as we have the command of the sea, and our trade could be conducted in that case, as before, by the Cape of Good Hope; and if Russia did occupy Egypt and had possession of the Canal, and did not go to war with us, she would have no motive whatever to obstruct our commerce, or that of any other nation but Turkey, and the traffic of the world would be conducted otherwise precisely as before.

It will be observed that Captain Hobart, who one might otherwise forget to be an Englishman under his Turkish rank as Hobart Pasha, has returned to Constantinople, having as yet achieved with his enormous fleet no better feat than capturing several prizes loaded with corn, all English property, which will contribute to make bread dearer to the English people, when it is already at an unusually high price, and when there is much distress from commercial depression. But what can one expect from a mercenary adventurer?

Mr. Freeman thus severely, but justly, animadverts on the conduct of this man, Hobart, who ought to be, if he is not already, like Omar Pasha, a naturalised and Mahometan Turk: "Crete in the end was conquered, and again to the shame of England, it was largely conquered by means of an Englishman. This was an English naval officer, Hobart by name, who was not ashamed to enter into the service of the barbarian, to take his pay, and help him to bring Christian nations under the yoke. . . . There was another Englishman, Robert of St. Albans, a Knight of the Temple, who betrayed his order, his country, and his faith; who took service under Saladin, and mocked the last agonies of the Christians when Jerusalem was taken. The shame of Robert of St. Albans has its like in the shame of Hobart."

This capture has been wrongfully made, in spite of the notorious fact that the blockade is ineffective, and that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs admitted in the House of Commons, on June 11th, that the Government "had heard privately that a line of steamers was running from Odessa to Nicholaieff," which clearly and irrefutably establishes the fact that the blockade is ineffective, and several captures of Turkish vessels have been made in the Black Sea by the Russian navy. Yet we submit to any wrong and any amount of loss to help our dear friends the Turks.

The *Nord Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of 11th October, 1876, says:—"Amongst the German people nothing is less existent than sentiments which might lead German policy to take chestnuts out of the fire for England, and England will not be able to find in Germany an ally which will be disposed to share its profits and losses on the Eastern Question."

The *National Zeitung* says: "The Tory ministry has deceived itself in respect to public opinion in its own country, as it has also deceived itself on the subject of the situation of Europe. England would be alone in a contest against Russia, as we were alone in our contest against France. Let the Czar annex to his empire Batoum, Kars, Erzeroum, and even Trebizond—that will be a matter of indifference to no matter what state in Europe,

England excepted. On the contrary, the more that Russia is involved in the affairs of Asia the less she will be able to weigh on Europe. It follows from all this that an Anglo-Russian War is only an eventuality of a distant future. England has always been obliged, in consequence of its insular position, to make its great wars with allies on the Continent; even in the contest with the Americans she required mercenary German troops. For the first time she has no ally."

A FORECAST OF THE PROBABLE RESULTS OF THE PRESENT RUSSO-TURKISH WAR.

It seems to be universally believed that Turkey must succumb in her present struggle with Russia; indeed, the corrupt bureaucracy and wire pullers of Constantinople anticipate and fear the result.

We have already seen that the Russians have gained important successes, especially at Ardahan, that the Principalities have joined Russia and declared war against Turkey, that Servia and Greece are shortly expected to do the same, and that a state of siege has had to be proclaimed in Constantinople to prevent the instant dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. Two Turkish monitors have been already blown up, and the Turkish fleet will probably be soon as afraid of the Russians as they were in the Greek war of independence, when sixteen small Greek vessels drove forty Turkish men-of-war to seek safety at Constantinople. The soldiers, and even the officers, as I have already stated on Mr. Jocelyn's authority, are in arrears of pay for from six to thirty-three months. They are badly clothed, badly fed, and utterly unfit for campaigning, whilst the Russian army, besides being more numerous, is in the highest state of efficiency, and has all the confidence of being commanded by officers of proved ability, and fighting in a just and noble cause, instead of being driven to the shambles by Turkish Pashas, who are mere palace favourites and carpet knights, in an unjust and disgraceful cause.

The odds, however, are not so unequal as to entitle the Turks to any sympathy for being the weakest, as, though the popu-

lation is not much more than half that of Russia, it is more concentrated. They have the services of many foreign, and I regret to say, some English mercenaries. They are fighting on their own soil; and besides, thanks to the credulous English and other investors, the Turks have been supplied gratuitously with an apparently formidable fleet. However, when the Russian fleet in the Baltic and elsewhere reinforces the Black Sea fleet, and when a few more Turkish men-of-war have been blown up by such heroes as blew up the last monitor, we shall soon see the Turks eagerly suing for peace, and the harder the terms are the better I for one shall be satisfied.

It would not be just to the Russian people if the Czar was not to exact such conditions of peace as would amply compensate Russia for the sacrifices it has made, as well as give far better security to the Christians than those which the Porte declined at the Conference.

England very foolishly, with quixotic liberality, and to the utter neglect of our just rights, at the conclusion of a war foregoes all claim to costs, though no Englishman ever fails to demand and exact costs and damages in any action at law which is decided in his favour. The Germans, to their credit, compelled France to pay an indemnity, which not only paid their expenses, but left a considerable margin to pension the widows and orphans of those who were killed by the French in an unjust war; and I trust Russia will pursue the same course in so far as it is practicable with such a bankrupt as Turkey. I would fain hope that Russia would re-establish the Greek Empire, but I should anticipate that Russia would at least demand that all that part of Turkey north of the Balkans should form one State or confederation of States perfectly independent of Turkey—but if she only did this, a very large portion of Bulgaria, including Philippopolis, the scene of the massacres, which is south of the Balkans, would remain under Turkish oppression, which would be most illogical and objectionable—that Montenegro should obtain a large accession of territory; that the whole of Epirus, Thessaly, and all the remaining Turkish islands should be added to Greece; and that

she herself should obtain the whole of Armenia and the Euphrates Valley, down to the Persian Gulf; that Egypt should be independent, and obtain Syria and Palestine; and that she should receive from the Principalities, from Servia, and from Egypt, a sum to be raised like the indemnity paid by France to Germany, equal to the capital value of the tribute now paid by these States to Turkey; not as tribute, for they would be as free of Russia as of Turkey.

Some politicians have expressed much curiosity as to the course which Germany might probably pursue in case of the great Russian victories which may be expected, and I think we have some indication of this in the debate in the Prussian Parliament, on December 5th, in a speech by Prince Bismarck, in which he says, "Russia does not aim at great conquests. The Emperor Alexander has ever been a loyal ally to us, and Russia only asks us for our co-operation at the Conference for the improvement of the position of the Christians in Turkey, a purpose to which our Emperor and our nation willingly offer a helping hand. That we shall support this object is beyond all question. This support is justified by sympathy for our co-religionists and for the purposes of civilization. Should the Conference not lead to any results, warlike action on the part of Russia is probable. Russia, however, does not ask our assistance for that purpose, although no one will expect us to impose our veto against it, since objects are concerned for which we ourselves are striving. . . . As long as we stand upon this place you will never succeed in making a rent in our friendship for Russia, a friendship which has lasted for centuries, and is based upon history. We must maintain good relations with the Powers, and can *only* actively interpose if one of our friends is imperilled by another power," which is supposed to refer to Austria.

It seems to me from this perfectly clear that Prussia intends to adopt a very friendly neutrality to Russia, and that nothing but perhaps a permanent annexation, not a temporary occupation of the mouths of the Danube and Constantinople, would induce Germany to go to war with Russia.

As to Austro-Hungary, the President of the Hungarian Ministry, M. Tisza, has wisely pointed out to the Hungarian Philo-Turks that it might have been plausibly argued, that seven years ago Austria ought to have made common cause with France, to prevent Prussia from becoming the Dictator of Central Europe, and from some day annexing the German Provinces of Austria. Yet Austria prudently kept out of the Franco-German War, and in the same way she will keep out of the Russo-Turkish War if possible.

Those who are now urging on the British nation to undertake another Crimean war should first think over the following eloquent sentences by Mr. G. A. Sala, which appeared in the *Illustrated London News* and afterwards in the *Times* :—

"The bodies of some eight thousand Englishmen moulder peacefully in this graveyard. I fancy that the remembrance of their deaths might moderate the frenzy of the politicians who seem bent on hounding England on to a fresh war with Russia. Surely those politicians must be mainly young men, or they must have very short memories. I remember the episodes of the Crimean war as though they had happened yesterday, for then, as now, I was earning my daily bread by literature and journalism; and the war brought me every day fresh materials for my pen. I was within an ace in 1856 of going to Sebastopol; but I went to Russia instead. Can you not recall, you who are middle-aged, and whose memories are good, those two miserable years between the fight at the Alma and the fall of the Malakoff! Do you remember the Ghost's Derby Day of 1855? Do you remember when, on the cliff at Brighton and the Marina at St. Leonard's, you could scarcely walk ten paces without meeting groups of ladies and children clad in deepest mourning for their fathers, husbands, brothers, sweethearts, slain in that wretched Chersonese, or who had sickened and died in the cheerless wards of the Scutari Hospital? Are we to have those years of private agony and bereavement, of public blundering and mismanagement, over again? I suppose so. Glory is a very fine thing. I am only a *pékin*, a civilian, and I know nothing about Glory; but I confess

that my blood runs cold, and that my heart sickens, when I hear politicians pertly prating about the 'arbitrament of the sword,' and 'war clearing the atmosphere,' and so forth. I never met Glory yet, and I don't know what he or she is like; but I have met war face to face half a dozen times in as many countries. I have looked into the whites, or rather the crimsons, of his eyes, and I have gazed upon the Sisters who follow him wheresoever he goes. They are Three Sisters, and their names are Rapine and Disease and Death. This is, of course, a miserably craven and spiritless way of looking at War. I cannot help it. I have seen only War's madness and wickedness, its foulness and squalor. To me it has represented nothing but robbery and profligacy, but famine and slaughter; and I can but think that if the warlike politicians were to witness just half an hour of actual warfare as I have witnessed it, in America, in Italy, in Mexico, in France, in Spain, their martial ardour would cool down a little, and they would not be quite so prompt to blow the bellicose trumpet."

If we involve ourselves in a war with Russia without the assistance of any other Power but effete Turkey, we may expect such enormous financial difficulties that we may perhaps be obliged to return to that former system of taxation, which now exists in America, upon almost every article which we use, and which the late Sydney Smith depicted as follows :—

"We can inform Brother Jonathan," he writes, "what are the inevitable consequences of being too fond of glory—taxes. Taxes upon every article which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under foot—taxes upon everything which it is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell, or taste—taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion—taxes on everything on the earth or in the waters under the earth—on everything that comes from abroad or is grown at home—taxes on the raw material—taxes upon every fresh value that is added to it by the industry of man—taxes on the sauce which pampers man's appetite and the drug that restores him to health—on the ermine which decorates the judge and the rope which hangs the criminal—on the poor man's salt and the rich man's spice—on the brass nails of the coffin and the

ribbons of the bride—at bed or board, couchant or levant, we must pay. The schoolboy whips his taxed top, the beardless youth manages his taxed horse, with a taxed bridle, on a taxed road; and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine, which has paid 7 per cent., into a spoon which has paid 15 per cent., flings himself back upon his chintz bed, which has paid 22 per cent., and expires in the arms of an apothecary who has paid a licence of a hundred pounds for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is then immediately taxed from 2 to 10 per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel. His virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble, and he is then gathered to his fathers—to be taxed no more."

Mr. Sandford, a Conservative M.P., in the debate of the 30th of May, made the following very sensible observations on the Eastern Question, and concluded by a reasonable but inadequate programme of the probable terms of peace, saying,

"The suppression of these conversations (between Lord Salisbury and Prince Bismarck and the Duc Decazes) created alarm, the more so because the conversations at Vienna and at Rome had been given. . . . The Foreign Secretary himself said that treaties were not eternal, and could only be maintained as long as circumstances permitted. . . . He believed that the Government of Turkey was intolerable alike for its Mahometan and its Christian subjects, and the mistake made in the autumn agitation was, that too exclusive stress was laid on the grievances of the Christians. When the disturbances first broke out in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the great Powers should have told Turkey that, if she did not undertake to reform her administration in a certain time, united Europe would call upon her to introduce some changes in her form of government. . . . We had no right to coerce Turkey without warning her, and up to the present moment the only warning she had received was that she was not to be coerced. We could not coerce Turkey as the ally of Russia, but as a member of the European concert. He looked on the Crimean War at the time with no very

favourable eye, believing it was undertaken for French rather than for English interests, and he had then thought it of comparatively small importance whether Constantinople was occupied by Russians or by Turks. . . . He believed in the moderation of the Czar. Russia would probably expect the restoration of the territory in Bessarabia, taken from her by the Treaty of Paris, perhaps also some part of Asia Minor. She might likewise possibly demand the passage of her fleet through the Dardanelles, and that the Bulgarians should be governed by independent rulers. Herzegovina and Bosnia might be added to Austria, and some small addition of territory given to Montenegro. The Sultan could retain the residue of his dominions, but only as the satrap of Russia."

Mr. Bourke said, "Under the Treaty of Paris, 'the common law right of interference' remained exactly where it was before, and our great proof of that was that in 1859 Her Majesty's Government addressed to the Porte one of the strongest despatches ever penned, calling attention to the condition of the Christian races under Ottoman rule, and stating unequivocally that this country would 'insist'—that was the word used—upon the promises of the Sultan being carried out. Therefore the right of interference not only existed theoretically under the Treaty of Paris, but had been acted upon by this country and *acknowledged by the Porte.*"

37967

MAHOMETANISM UNMASKED.

THE Philo-Turkish party—and especially the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of which Mr. Forsyth said the other day, "From its raving style lately it seemed to be written by maniacs for fools"—are never tired of throwing dust in the eyes of the British public on the Eastern Question, and they try to make us believe that the Mahometan religion is at least equal, if not superior, to Greek Christianity. I, therefore, now append some illustrations of Mahometanism, which is one of the basest, grossest, and most ridiculous superstitions which have ever degraded humanity, drawn from Ockley's 'History of the Saracens," a standard work, and from other sources.

One of the crucial tests of the moral worth of any race or nation is the mode in which their women are treated, and the opinion which the men entertain of the female sex; and Tacitus, in his great work on the Germans, especially praised them for their high respect and esteem for their women. His words, as nearly as I can recollect them, are: "Neither did they despise their counsel nor disregard their advice, but they considered that there was a singular wisdom and something holy about them." Now the Mahometans have attained an unenviable pre-eminence both for the contempt and distrust their religion inculcates for women and for the state of debasement and ignorance in which they keep them, as if on purpose to degrade them to their own vile conception of the sex; and as to the sensual Paradise to which the stupid and libidinous Turks look forward, Tom Moore tells us—

> "A Moslem's heaven's easy made,
> 'Tis but black eyes and lemonade" (*i.e.*, houris and sherbet).

A truly virtuous wife is, according to Mussulmans, rarely to be met with, and their general depravity is declared to be much greater than that of men. When woman was created, the devil, we are told, was delighted and said, "Thou art half of my

host, and thou art the depository of my secrets, and thou art my arrow with which I shoot and miss not." Mahomet said, "I stood at the gate of Paradise, and, lo! most of the inmates were poor, and *I stood at the gate of hell, and most of the inmates were women.*"

Mahomet could neither read nor write, and was pre-eminently immoral, and he married Ayesha, when she had attained the mature age of nine. In heaven he found an angel of so prodigious a stature that the distance between his eyes was equal to the length of a journey of 70,000 days, and in the fifth heaven he saw an angel so large that he could have swallowed the seven heavens and seven earths as easily as a pea, but he does not tell us how an angel who could swallow seven heavens and seven earths could be contained in the fifth heaven only.

Mahomet was so reverenced by his bigoted disciples that they would gather his spittle up and swallow it. He had fifteen wives, whereas his own Koran allows no Mussulman to have more than four, and he openly avowed that his chief pleasures were women and perfumes. The notorious Wilkes used to say of himself, "I never was a Wilkite," and so Mahomet never was a Mussulman, but laughed in his sleeve at the credulity of his followers. On one occasion, he accepted a challenge to bring the moon from heaven in presence of the whole assembly. Upon uttering his command that luminary, *full orbed, though but five days old,* leaped from the firmament, and bounding through the air alighted on the top of the Kaaba, after having encircled it by seven distinct evolutions. She, or more probably the man in the moon, is said to have paid reverence to the Prophet, addressing him in elegant Arabic in set phrases of encomium, and concluding with the formula of the Mussulman faith. This done, the moon is said to have descended from the Kaaba, to have entered the right sleeve of Mahomet's mantle, and to have made its exit by the left. After having traversed every part of his flowing robe, the planet separated into two parts as it mounted in the air. Then these two parts re-united in one round and luminous orb as before. No wonder that this idiotic superstition spread among the Arab savages, for Malcolm, in his History of Persia, relates the following

interview between the King of Persia and three Arab chiefs. The Arabs said, "Whatever thou hast said regarding the former condition of the Arabs is true. Their food was green lizards; they buried their daughters alive; nay, some of them feasted on dead carcases and drank blood, while others slew their relations, and thought themselves great and valiant men when by such an act they possessed themselves of more property. They were clothed with hair garments; knew not good from evil, and made no distinction between what is lawful and unlawful." Omar said, "If any man makes profession of our religion and then leaves it, we kill him." When Jerusalem capitulated, the following were some of the conditions which Omar granted, and these stipulations have been usually imitated by his successors: "The Christians shall build no new churches either in the city or adjoining territory. They shall not refuse entrance to Mussulmans to their churches by night or day. If any Mussulman should be on a journey, they shall be obliged to entertain him gratis for three days. They shall not persuade anyone to be of their religion. They shall pay respect to the Mussulmans, and, if they be sitting, rise up to them. They shall not ride upon saddles nor bear any sort of arms. They shall be obliged to keep the same sort of habit wherever they go, and always wear girdles upon their waists." Omar, like a true barbarian, ordered the magnificent Alexandrian library to be destroyed, saying that if they were adverse to the Koran they were injurious, whilst if they were favourable to it they were unnecessary, and the books were distributed among the warm baths in Alexandria to heat them, and it took six months before they were destroyed.

Dick Turpin and the other old English highwaymen, when they stopped a traveller, gave him the apparent choice of his money or his life, but if he resisted, the highwayman took his life and then his money. The Mahometans, after ravaging Asia and Africa, pursued their bloody conquests in Europe, and if it had not been for the victory of Charles Martel, at Tours, over the Saracens, European civilization would have been extinguished. The Turks, too, like a swarm of human locusts, devastated and conquered

Hungary, and if it had not been for Sobieski, who had, however, to abandon Polish Podolia to them, they might perhaps have overrun Europe. Like the highwaymen, the Mahometans offer those on whom they make unprovoked wars the choice of conversion, tribute, or the sword—or rather they offer this to the few they allow to remain, after killing most of the able-bodied men, and selling the women, girls, and *good-looking boys* into a slavery worse than death. Conversion to their abominable superstition is, of course, out of the question, and there remains only tribute or legalised robbery without any limit but the capacity of endurance of their unfortunate victims.

Freeman tells us in his recent admirable work on "The Ottoman Power in Europe": "For a Mahometan to embrace Christianity is a crime to be punished by death. . . . Other religions, Christianity among them, have been propagated by the sword, but it is Mahometanism alone which lays it down as a matter of religious duty that it should be so propagated. . . . No Christian nation has ever embraced Mahometanism; no Mahometan nation has ever embraced Christianity. . . . The utmost that the best Mahometan ruler can do is to save his subjects of other religions from actual persecution, from actual personal oppression; he cannot save them from degradation. He cannot, without forsaking the principles of his own religion, put them on the same level as Mussulmans. The utmost that he can do is to put his non-Mussulman subjects in a state which in every western country would be looked upon as fully justifying them in revolting against his rule. . . . No Mahometan ruler, I repeat, can give more than contemptuous toleration; he cannot give real equality of rights. One Mahometan ruler tried to do so, and not only tried, but succeeded. But he succeeded only by casting away the faith, which hindered his work. Akbar was the one prince born in Islam who gave equal rights to his subjects who did not profess the faith of Islam; but he was also the one prince born in Islam who cast away the faith of Islam. The Ottoman Turk has no claim to be placed side by side with the higher specimens of his own creed, with the early Saracens, or the Indian Moghuls."

THE SULTAN NOT THE HEAD OF THE MAHOMETAN RELIGION.

THE anti-Christian party in England dishonestly persist in endeavouring to frighten the country with the idea that the Sultan is the sacred head of the Mahometan religion, and that, if we had joined in contingent coercion, or even if we refrain from aiding him against Russia, there would be great risk of a rebellion of the forty millions of Mahometans who inhabit India, though, if they did rebel, we have one hundred and fifty millions of non-Mahometans, besides British troops, to put them down. It has been shown over and over again in the House of Commons, in the press, at public meetings, and elsewhere, by men who have lived for the greater portion of their lives in India, and who have attained high positions there (like Sir George Campbell), that this is all nonsense. But none are so blind as those who will not see, and as to their prejudices, like the toys which represent fat Chinese mandarins rounded below, the stronger the blow with which they are knocked over the more violent is the recoil with which they reassume their former position.

Mr. Baillie, who is recognised as, perhaps, the greatest authority in England on Indian laws and customs, in a paper read before the Asiatic Society, showed conclusively that the Sultan of Turkey has no claim whatever to be the head of the Mussulman religion. At the present time there is no Caliph, and, as the head of the Mahometan religion must be of the tribe of Koreish, with which the Sultan has not the most distant affinity, he is utterly disqualified from the possibility of becoming Caliph, and has never undergone the necessary preliminary of being duly elected; and the only recognised chief of the Mussulmans is the

Shereef of Mecca, who is of the right lineage. The total number of Mahometans, according to Dieterici, in 1859, was 170,000,000, of which about 42,000,000 inhabit the Turkish Empire, and of these 3,611,480 are encamped in Europe, whilst there are 4,792 443 Christians in the Turkish dominions in Europe. According to the *Almanac de Gotha* for 1877, whilst there are 40,227,552 Mahometans in India, and 8,428,658 Mahometans in the Russian Empire, of whom 2,363,658 are in Europe, the rest of the Mahometans inhabit various parts of Asia, including China and Africa; and by far the greater portion have never even heard of the existence of the Sultan; the Emperor of Morocco, for instance, does not at all recognise the precedence of the Sublime Porte, nor did any Mahometan Power in the whole world give the least assistance to Turkey in any of the ten wars which she has waged with such disastrous results against Russia, nor did the Sultan receive any pecuniary assistance from individual Mussulmans of any other nationality.

It is notorious that Mehemet Ali rebelled against the Sultan, that his son marched within eighty leagues of Constantinople amid the acclamations of the people of Syria and Asia Minor, and that Mehemet Ali would infallibly have become Sultan if the Russians had not in 1833 protected Constantinople by a fleet and army, and in 1839 the whole Turkish fleet voluntarily sailed into Alexandria and embraced the service of Mehemet Ali. Ali Pasha and various other Turkish subjects have also rebelled against the Sultan.

Even now that the Sultan is contending single-handed against Russia, the Khedive of Egypt, after urgent and incessant entreaties for assistance, has only sent 3,000 men to aid the Sultan in addition to the 9,000 whom he is bound to supply, whilst he sent about 50,000 men to make an unprovoked attack on Abyssinia. Even the Turks have not and could not possibly entertain any respect or regard for the Sultans, or, if they do, they take a singular way of showing it, namely, deposing and murdering them.

Of the thirty-six Sultans who have reigned between A.D. 1299 and A.D. 1877 no less than fifteen were deposed, of whom seven

are known to have been murdered, and most of the remaining ten were probably also assassinated; so that the way the Turks show their affection and respect for their Sultans is to depose every second Sultan, and to murder at least one in three.

The following facts will show how far the Sultans of Turkey deserved the regard and esteem of their subjects, and the unprecedented loyalty of the Turks to their sovereign:—

Amurath I. (accession, A.D. 1360) was stabbed by a soldier, of which wound he died.

Bajazet I. (1389) died imprisoned.

Solyman (1403) was dethroned by his brother.

Musa Chelebi (1410) was strangled.

Amurath III. (1574) killed his five brothers—their mother in grief stabbed herself.

Mahomet III. (1595) strangled all his brothers and drowned his father's wives.

Mustapha I. (1617) was deposed and imprisoned.

Osman II. (1618) was strangled.

Mustapha I. was made Sultan again, then deposed, again imprisoned, and strangled.

Ibrahim (1640) was strangled.

Mahomet IV. (1648) was deposed by his brother.

Mustapha II. (1695) was deposed.

Ahmed III. (1703) was deposed and died (or was murdered?) in prison.

Selim III. (1789) was deposed and murdered.

Abdul Aziz (1861) was deposed and alleged to have committed suicide, but it is suspected that he was murdered.

Amurath V. (1876) was deposed.

The above dates are those of the accession of the various Sultans. As to the present Sultan,* who married a Belgian shop girl, that clever journal, *Truth*, says on February 22nd, 1877: "We have seen enough of Abdul Hamid to know that he is utterly weak, and although liberal and well-intentioned, has no notion of govern-

* The Sultan's wife was a niece of Mrs. Tomkins, linendraper at Pera.

ment, and is not likely to acquire any while Mahmoud directs his entourage. It is strange how Sultan after Sultan seems to succumb to some mysterious influence, so soon as he ascends the throne. It is said that Hamid will soon suffer from the mental malady that affected his two predecessors." And here is the account which the same well-informed and amusing paper gives of the Sultan's appearance at the opening of the Turkish Parliament:

"More years ago than I care to count, I saw the father of the present Sultan, when on a visit to the second city of his empire, descend from his carriage and enter the house of a prosperous English merchant. . . . I was a child then, but I was struck by that monarch's uncertain gait, by his downcast eye, his depressed and timid look, bespeaking indifference so profound that I would have given anything to catch hold of him and shake him up into even momentary effervescence. When I saw Abdul Hamid come out yesterday, 'His father's son,' I said. He swayed on his stem, so to say, just as his father did, like a reed shaken by the wind. There was no more expression on his countenance than on the egg I cracked at breakfast. Wearily he took up his place. With downcast eyes, with a weary gesture, he summoned the Grand Vizier to his side, and with a languid hand he thrust a scroll into the Sadrazan's hand—the scroll which contained his speech—without betraying the slightest interest. . . . When the monotonous voice of Said Pasha was hushed, Abdul Hamid, who had stood all the time swaying like a tulip on its stem, made an awkward temana to the assembly, and with duck-like steps regained his apartments. The whole ceremony was simply deathlike; not a smile nor a gesture relieved it."

It has not been the custom of the Sultans of Turkey for some centuries to contract regular marriages nor to restrict themselves, though falsely pretending to be the head of the Mahometan religion, to the number of wives prescribed by the Koran. The women are bought and brought in like brood mares.

So much for the Sultans, of whom it used to be said, as an evidence of their devastating ferocity, "No grass grows where the hoof of a Sultan's horse has trod."

Dr. Birdwood states that the absurd theory that the Sultan is the Caliph, or the head of the Mussulman religion, has been trumped up by an able and learned but unscrupulous renegade named Ahmed Faris Effendi, the editor of the (*Al*) *Jawâib*, of Constantinople, an Arabic newspaper, which unfortunately has a large circulation throughout the East, and even among Eastern Christians.

Ahmed Faris was originally a Maronite, was converted to Protestantism, was employed as a teacher in the schools of the Church Missionary Society at Cairo, afterwards translated the whole Bible into Arabic, then embraced Mahometanism, and about 1858 started this mischievous paper, which, however, is not read more extensively in many parts of the East than the *Times*. Dr. Birdwood says, "There is not the slightest authority for the claim of the Sultans of Constantinople to the Caliphate, but their assumption of the title is an illegal and heretical usurpation, and the assumption of their preposterous pretension to it by Mahometans is discreditable equally to their orthodoxy, their intelligence, and their good faith. . . . There has been no Caliph of Islam since Bagdad was taken by the Tartars in A.D. 1258. A pretender to the lineage of the Abassides was, a few years afterwards, set up as a false Caliph by the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt, and when Egypt was conquered by Selim I., the pretence is, that the Sultans of Constantinople succeeded to the false Caliphate. But the Arabs never accepted the Cairene Caliphs, and in fact the pretension of the Sultans was practically lost sight of for centuries, and it is only since 1856 that the spiritual theory of the office has been revived. . . . The arrangement of the succession to the false Egyptian Caliphate . . was simoniacal and detestable in the eyes of all orthodox Mahometans."

Englishmen talk of the Sultan of Turkey as *the* Sultan, but, in fact, the first Sultan was only an Emir, and assumed the title without any right, and there are a considerable number of other Sultans, such as the Sultan of Zanzibar, &c.

Professor Monier Williams, who has recently returned from India, says in the *Times*, as to the Mahometans: "By far the

majority are, like the Turks, Sunnis (Shiites) ; but from conversations I had with several learned men, I feel convinced that they have no idea of acknowledging the Sultan of Constantinople as their spiritual head, and that the existence of sympathy between India and Turkey is a figment of political agitators."

I will terminate this chapter with the following touching sketch, from the able pen of the lamented Thackeray :—

"In this dismal but splendid museum I remarked two little tombs, with little red fezzes, very small and for very young heads evidently, which were lying under the little embroidered palls of state. I forget whether they had candles too; but their little flame of life was soon extinguished, and there was no need of many pounds of wax to typify it. These were the tombs of Mahmoud's grandsons, nephews of the present Light of the Universe, and children of his sister, the wife of Halil Pacha. Little children die in all ways ; those of the 'much maligned' Mahometan royal race perish by the bow-string. Sultan Mahmoud (may he rest in glory!) strangled the one; but, having some spark of human feeling, was so moved by the wretchedness and agony of the poor bereaved mother, his daughter, that his royal heart relented towards her, and he promised that should she ever have another child it should be allowed to live. He died, and Abdul Medjid (may his name be blessed!), the debauched young man whom we just saw riding to the mosque, succeeded. The sister, whom he is said to have loved, became again a mother, and had a son ; but she relied upon her father's word and her august brother's love, and hoped that this little one should be spared. The same accursed hand tore this infant out of its mother's bosom and killed it. The poor woman's heart broke outright; at this second calamity she died. But on her death-bed she sent for her brother, rebuked him as a perjurer and an assassin, and expired, calling down the Divine justice on his head. She lies now by the side of the two little fezzes. . . . After the murder of that little child, it seems to me one can never look with anything but horror upon the butcherly Herod who ordered it. The death of the seventy

thousand Janissaries ascends to historic dignity, and takes rank as war; but a great prince and Light of the Universe, who procures abortions, and throttles little babies, dwindles away into such a frightful insignificance of crime, that those may respect him who will. I pity their excellencies the ambassadors, who are obliged to smirk and cringe to such a rascal."

"THE UNSPEAKABLE TURK."

Of all the races who profess the Mahometan religion, the Turks are the most ignorant, the most debased, and the most cruel and oppressive. Even to men of their own race and religion they have often acted with the utmost barbarity and injustice. When Paskiewitch took one of the chief fortresses in Asia, Suleiman, the governor, defended it with extraordinary valour; but when it was taken, the Grand Vizier sent him as usual the bowstring, and the life of this brave man was only saved by the mingled entreaties and threats of the magnanimous Russian General, whose interest it obviously was that so formidable an adversary should be destroyed. Then, again, there never was an act more perfidious and cruel than the massacre of the Janissaries, and besides the original massacre, thousands suspected of favouring them were executed daily for a considerable time.

The Conservative historian, Alison, who cannot be suspected of any bias against the Turks, says respecting Turkey, "In the level country, where the horsemen of the Osmanlis have found it easy to extend their ravages, and the Pashas their oppression, the human race has in many places wholly disappeared; and the mournful traveller, after traversing for days together the richest plains, studded with the ruins of ancient cities, now left without a single inhabitant, has repeatedly expressed a dread of the entire annihilation of the human species in the very garden of nature, the places in the world best adapted for its reception.

"M. de Tchitchatchef mentions a rich plain in Asia Minor of 600 square miles, and of which scarcely fifty are cultivated. The

Turkish Empire is perishing from want of inhabitants. The Ottoman Empire now contains not a third of its population in former times—not a fifth of what it is capable of maintaining. Constantinople is fed from Alexandria, Odessa, and Galatz, not from the lands possessed or directly ruled by Turks;' and at one period these tyrants went so far as to prohibit the exportation of grain from Moldavia or Wallachia to any other place than Constantinople. . . . "Justice is venal in the Ottoman. . . . The Turkish jurisprudence consists in a few maxims from the Koran, and a few traditionary principles handed down in the courts. Written statutes, collections of decisions, they have none. . . . The defendant or culprit, if poor, is bastinadoed; if rich or a Frank, he is amerced in a pecuniary fine, called an 'avaria'; if a thief or robber, he is hanged. . . . The situations of Vizier, Cadi, and the like are sold to the highest bidder. . . . The number of servants and retainers in the establishments of the Pashas and the affluent amounts to 1,500,000, a burden nearly as heavy as a standing army to the same amount would be, and far more enervating to the state. . . . A tax of 17 per cent. is levied on incomes, and there is an export duty of 12 per cent. . . . If a hostile army reaches Constantinople, the conquest of the capital is easy, and cannot be long averted. The ancient walls still remain in imposing majesty, but they are in many places mouldering; and by cutting off the aqueducts which supply the city with water, it may easily be starved into submission."

In 1529, Soliman the Magnificent massacred the garrison of Buda, contrary to the capitulation, and at Altenburg all the inhabitants were slaughtered.

Of Mahomet II. it is said that "he knew neither faith nor law, cared nothing for integrity, and laughed at all religions, not excepting that of the Prophet."

In 1683, says Lady Verney, the Grand Vizier caused the Pasha of Buda to be strangled in his presence because his soldiers refused to fight, though he was a brave, honest, old man who had been wounded before Vienna. As to the atrocities of the Turks to the Christians, a series of the English statutes or the "Encyclopœdia Britan-

nica," volumes as numerous as those of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, printed in diamond type, would not nearly suffice to contain them.

I have already cited Mr. Baring's report on the massacre of Batak and other evidence, and it would weary and disgust the reader to give an abstract of the more prominent instances of Turkish cruelty and barbarity; and when one peruses the horrible details, one is apt to think that the world consists of men and women who have the ordinary feelings of humanity, and of Turks who are mere beasts of prey. I will, however, quote a few more instances of Turkish ferocity. When the Turks took Zbaras, in Poland, in 1672, Ibrahim cut to pieces the whole population, except the women, who were rescued for the seraglios, and the boys, who were retained for that modern Sodom—Constantinople. The old and the children perished in the flames or by the sword, and the Turks moved on to other sieges where the same horrible cruelties were exercised. The Philo-Turks may, therefore, take note that their Ottoman allies have exercised far worse cruelties on their new-found friends, the Poles, than any which can be alleged against the Russians.

In the debate on 29th January, 1828, Lord John Russell said, "We believe the battle (Navarino) to have been a glorious victory and a necessary consequence of the Treaty of London, and, moreover, as honest a victory as had ever been gained from the beginning of the world. . . . Turkey was spoken of constantly as our ancient ally. Now the fact was, that there had never been any alliance between Turkey and this country prior to 1799, and it was not twenty years since Mr. Arbuthnot had been compelled to fly privately from Constantinople from his fear that his personal safety would be endangered by a violation of the ordinary rights of ambassadors." It was then, I may add, the custom of Turkey to imprison ambassadors who displeased them in the Seven Towers, and the Turkish Government usually bribed the dragoman to pretend, in translating the ambassador's speech, that he was using the most obsequious and even slavish language such as, "Your vile slave lays at your feet the homage of your poor

dependent, the chief of the English infidels, and comes to present his usual tribute, to implore your clemency, and to hear and obey your commands;" and he was told to explain the upright position and bold mien of the Ambassador, by saying—in Turkish, of course—that that was the most abject position for an Englishman, and that kneeling and licking the dust would be a mark of contempt and an assertion of equality with the Sultan.

In the same debate Lord Holland contended that the Turk could not be termed, in any correct sense of the words, an ally of this country at all, and much less an ancient ally. "The anti-social race," said his lordship, "which now enjoys the throne of the Constantines, considers itself naturally at war with every nation with which it has not entered into a formal treaty of peace. But can a treaty of peace be fairly considered as a treaty of alliance? The first treaty made between this country and Turkey, I have no doubt, was considered by the Turks as an act of grace and concession, yielded by them, in the plenitude of their power, to those dogs of Christians, the Nazarene nations. . . We had no political relations with Turkey, in any sense of the word, until the year 1699. In 1699, we offered our services to mediate between the Emperor of Germany and the Turkish power, who were then at war; and we did so, in order to leave our ancient ally, the House of Austria—for Austria was our ancient ally; *and Russia, too, was our ancient ally*—in a situation to direct her arms, along with us, against the then colossal power of France. And what was the result of that negotiation? We were accused, by French writers—I shall not stop to examine whether rightly or wrongly—of having exercised our mediation with gross partiality, and with having inflicted by it a severe injury on the Ottoman power. One of the articles in the treaty into which the Turks entered under our mediation was to this effect: that they should surrender the whole of the Morea and of Greece into the hands of the Venetians. So that the result of our first political negotiation with Turkey was to wrest Greece from its dominion; though, unfortunately, not for ever. In the year 1718, we again entered into a political negotiation with Turkey; but under cir-

cumstances which, I contend, still preclude us from denominating her our 'ancient ally.' It is right, however, to state that, by that treaty, we recognised Turkey as the Sovereign of Greece, which a fatal war had enabled her to recover from the Venetians. . . Mr. Addison, too, who was not only a philosopher, but one of the wisest and best men on the face of the earth, remarked upon the bad effect of the numerous journalists in this country, and the great spirit of writing and reading politics in the country, and went on to say that, though there was no absurdity to which people, by this itch for talking and writing politics, might not be brought, *he did not believe it possible that there could be persons in England who could think that we were interested in the prosperity of the Ottoman empire!* . . . Almost every man who had held office, and had authority, stated *that the opinion of Lord Chatham was, that we should never have any kind of connection whatever with the Ottoman Porte!* and that opinion was fortified during the seven years' war by a similar opinion of the King of Prussia. *In* 1770, *our allies, the Russians, sent a great fleet into the Mediterranean, for the purpose of overpowering the Turks.* What was the policy of this country? *To assist the Russian navy.* That fleet was refitted in our harbours, and, with the munitions and implements which it received from us, burnt a Turkish town and fleet, and continued cruising in the Archipelago for no less than five or six years.

Mr. Burke, too, spoke thus of our 'ancient and faithful ally,' the Turk: '*I have never before heard it held forth that the Turkish Empire has ever been considered as any part of the balance of power in Europe. They despise and contemn all Christian princes as infidels, and only wish to subdue and exterminate them and their people!* What have these worse than savages to do with the powers of Europe, but to spread war, destruction, and pestilence amongst them? *The ministers and the policy which shall give these people any weight in Europe will deserve all the bans and curses of posterity.*' Very strange language this in an English House of Commons, regarding an 'ancient and faithful ally!' This mighty master proceeds: '*All that is holy in religion, all that is moral and humane, demands an abhorrence of everything which*

tends to extend the power of that cruel and wasteful Empire. Any Christian power is to be preferred to these destructive savages!' In truth, the first alliance really made with Turkey by this country was an alliance formed in the year 1798 or 1799, in consequence of the invasion of Egypt by the French, who have often been reproached with being, though they never acknowledged that they were, an ancient ally of the Ottoman Empire. When they invaded Egypt, *and not before*, we entered into a treaty of alliance with the Porte. My lords, I have looked into that treaty this very evening, and I am surprised to find that, so far from its being a treaty of alliance formed for the mutual interests of Turkey and England as against the rest of the world, or as connected with commerce—so far from being a treaty of alliance formed for the protection of the Turkish Empire against its immediate invaders—it is a treaty of alliance on the invitation of an *old and natural ally, the Emperor of Russia*, to enter, for the first time, into an alliance with the Turk. The words of the first article are, 'His Britannic Majesty, connected already with His Majesty the Emperor of Russia by the ties of the *strictest alliance*, accedes by the present treaty to the defensive alliance which has just been concluded between His Majesty the Ottoman Emperor, and the Emperor of Russia, as far as the stipulations thereof are applicable to the local circumstances of his Empire and that of the Sublime Porte.' Thus all the alliance which we then made with Turkey, was made at the express request of Russia. This treaty of alliance itself, too, was limited in its duration to seven years; and, *strange to say, long before these seven years had expired, Turkey had broken all the main articles of that treaty which bound it to remain at peace with Russia. It broke them, too, in so far as they related to ourselves.*"

In the debate on the 1st February, 1828, Mr. Hobhouse (afterwards Lord Broughton) said that he spent some time in Turkey, and was in habits of intercourse with a number of very respectable Mussulmans, but he never met with one who had even heard of the English House of Commons. "To me it seems," said he, "very likely that the Grand Signior will be greatly exasperated

when he finds himself called by the King of England 'his ancient ally.' What! the brother of the sun and moon! the lord of the Black and White Seas! the vicar of Mahomet!—to class him with a mere lord of merchants, with the master of infidel slaves, who are permitted to sell scissors and to buy raisins in the Levant!'

Sir James Mackintosh, thecelebrated historian, said in the same debate, "It was bare justice to Russia to say that her dealings with the Ottoman power for the last seven years had been marked with as great forbearance as the conduct of that power (Turkey) had been distinguished by continued insolence and incorrigible contumacy. If any one were disposed to deny this, let them look to the history of the Servian deputies, and they must admit that if Russia was to be blamed at all, it was rather for the long patience she had exercised than for any premature interferences. . . . A body of Servian deputies appointed to carry the provisions of the treaty of Bucharest into effect, went to Constantinople for that purpose, and the Turks sent these deputies to the Seven Towers and kept them in confinement for the space of seven years, and all this Russia endured. The war against the Greeks was waged against defenceless women and children, with the superadded aggravation of the burning of villages, the rooting up of trees, the destruction not only of works of art but of the productions of nature herself as well as those of men."

On 24th March, 1828, Mr. Peel (afterwards Sir Robert) told the House of Commons, "Previous to the signature of the Treaty (of July 6th) an intimation was given to His Majesty's Government that it *was the intention of Turkey to remove from the Morea the female part of the population and the children for the purpose of selling them in Egypt as slaves*, &c. Distinct notification was given to Ibrahim Pasha that so violent an exercise of rights—if rights they could be called—that a proceeding so repugnant to the established usage of civilized nations never would be permitted by His Majesty, and that this country would certainly resist any attempt to carry such an object into effect."

Lord Holland further stated, July 16th, 1828, "I hope I shall never see—God forbid that I should ever see—for the proposition

would be scouted from one end of England to another—any preparations or any proposition or any attempt to defend this our ancient ally (Turkey) from the attacks of its enemies. There was no arrangement made in that treaty for preserving the crumbling and hateful, or as Mr. Burke called it, the wasteful and disgusting Empire of the Turks from dismemberment and destruction.

"If it was the intention of those who signed the treaty of peace to sign it with a mental reservation . . . their conduct would resemble that of some infidel Christian in Constantinople—some dog as he is there called—who would prostrate himself at the feet of the Grand Signior and say, 'I shall be obliged to your sublime highness to emancipate all the rebellious Greeks, to enable them to buy and sell property, to enjoy perfect freedom in truth and toleration in religion; and if you do not consent to make these concessions, why, I will go home with my tail between my legs and take no ulterior measures to enforce my request.'

"I certainly was very much surprised to be told by the noble viscount that there are traditional agreements between Turkey and this country, and that Mussulmans were so superior to Christians in their adherence to their engagements that he would trust the word of a Turk more than he would a Christian oath."

So late as 1816, the Barbary Pirates (subjects of Turkey) preyed on the commerce of the world, and sold the Christians captured by them into slavery; yet we did not, as we ought to have done, force the Porte to put down piracy and slavery, but tamely submitted, until at last we could bear it no longer, and we sent Lord Exmouth to batter down that nest of pirates, Algiers, and compel them to give up Christian slavery and piracy.

Even when the British army was in Bulgaria, we were unable to protect the Christians, as appears by the following letter from Lord Raglan to the Secretary of State for War, dated Varna, August 8th, 1854. Yet the Philo-Turkish party wish to persuade us that the wrongs of the Christians can be redressed, not only without liberating the Christians from Turkish rule, but without even granting them the same *constitution as the Principalities*, or even the local autonomy of Syria. He gives the reason "how it

arose that the Bulgarian peasantry manifest such reluctance to bring supplies to our camp," as follows :—

"The reason is now obvious. These unfortunate people dare not appear there. They are liable to be robbed on their return home, and to be ill-used as soon as it is known that they are in possession of any money, and they are fortunate if they are not carried off, and, if not ransomed at the price demanded, murdered, as the accompanying papers show to have been the case in more than one instance. Hence it is that the Christian inhabitants of the province hail any change as preferable to the yoke under which they are now being crushed, and it may be relied upon that, as long as the Turks are allowed to carry arms, and the Bulgarians are not permitted to carry any, the existence of the latter will be, to use the language of Colonel Gordon, little better than that of slaves."

I am here reminded of a magnificent passage in Burke's speech on the trial of Warren Hastings, which I will quote as nearly as I can recollect it : "There, where that flag was flying which was wont to cheer the oppressed and elevate the subdued heart of misery, these interesting but unfortunate beings were doomed to experience that there is something deeper than destruction—something blacker than despair!"

In reply to this, the Duke of Newcastle merely said that he would "write to Lord Clarendon, with the view to a formal application to the Porte through Lord Stratford," and of course nothing was done; and, having secured the integrity of the Porte by obliging the Russians to evacuate the Principalities, we then proceeded to establish its independence by invading Russia, destroying Sebastopol, and ultimately forcing Russia to abandon her protection of the Turkish Christians, and debarring ourselves from providing any equivalent substitute.

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, on June 22nd, 1853, says in a letter to M. Pisani, "You will communicate to Redschid Pasha the several extracts of consular reports from Scutari, Monastir, and Prevesa, annexed to this instruction. You will observe that they relate in part to those acts of disorder, injustice, and corruption,

sometimes of a very atrocious kind, *which I have frequently brought* by your means to the knowledge of the Ottoman Porte."

In another letter he says, "The character of these disorderly and brutal outrages may be said with truth to be in general that of Mussulman fanaticism, excited by cupidity and hatred against the Sultan's Christian subjects." Up to the end of 1853, no Christian was allowed, even by the laws of Turkey, to give evidence in a court of justice against a Mussulman, and to the present day the law is a dead letter, except in the great cities.

The Turks establish their hospitals close to their batteries, and then complain if the Russians or Roumanians injure them, but they themselves fire at the Russian hospitals, though they are established at points far removed from the batteries. They also have been laying waste the Dobrudscha, their own country, which is a most barbarous and cruel proceeding. The Philo-Turks hope that the Russians will lose a considerable number of men the Dobrudscha, but the fact is, it is not so unhealthy as they suppose. A French army corps lost a large number of men from cholera there during the Crimean War, but the cholera was equally destructive elsewhere, and the crew of an English man-of-war, in the Black Sea, suffered nearly as much. The most formidable enemy of the Russians in 1829 was not the Turks, but the plague, which is chiefly caused by the abominable filth of the Turkish towns, and getting rid of the Turks would probably stamp out the plague.

The Bashi-Bazouks, says the *Times*, near Matchin, cut off the noses and lips of Russian soldiers. These mutilated bodies were seen by foreign correspondents.

Mr. Denton says, in the *Times*:—"Prince Nicholas of Montenegro was ready to maintain peace, but he would not purchase a peace on the conditions insisted upon, which were the expulsion of the Herzegovinian refugees—women, old men, and children, for the most part—without a guarantee for their safety. Prince Nicholas pleaded for their safety, and asked for a promise that they should not suffer because they had fled in terror from the Turk. This was refused. . . ."

Mr. Gladstone at Birmingham made the following able re-

marks on the Eastern Question :—"In the newspapers of Australia you will find articles on the afflictions of the subject races in Turkey as animated as any of those that have been written in our own journals . . . and at Otago, in New Zealand, there was held a public meeting, distinguished by as much enthusiasm as public meetings in Birmingham, to describe the sorrow and indignation with which they had heard of these horrors, and of the fact that no remedy had been applied. . . . Colonel Baker's book on Turkey, if you do read it, suppose you follow him in his reasoning, you will be apt to come to the conclusion that, after all, Christianity has been rather a calamity to the world, because Turks are persons, on the whole, of superior virtue. He says, indeed, they have certain vices, that they are extremely venal and corrupt, but how do you think he accounts for it? He says they got inoculated with these vices because, when they came into this country, they found it completely possessed by venality and corruption, and so the pure Mahometan virtue of the Turks gradually gave way to venality and corruption, which they inherited from their Christian predecessors in this country; and so, when slavery was abolished in the West Indies, was it because English travellers, going to the West Indies for their pleasure, or their sport, or their profit, brought back from thence those damning reports? No; almost the whole of them did as most of our travellers in Turkey now do—they came back saying what fine fellows the planters were, and how hospitable they were, how kind they were, how upright and truthful they were, and what shabby, mean, lying, pilfering fellows the negroes were. . . .

"The Government has made this excuse for the Turkish Government, 'that they were really and in good faith afraid of Mahometan opinion.' This was no novelty, no apology; it was the truth, but, being the truth, it was an aggravation of the case, for what did it show? . . . That the opinion of the Mahometan people and not merely of a few official men, as we are sometimes told demanded the massacres. . . . The Turks came in like other conquerors by force, but, instead of amalgamating themselves with the people, they stood apart from them like oil from water, and

claimed to use them for their purpose, to sell to them their own lives, those lives to be held at their mercy, their property, their liberty, their honour to be at the free disposal of the Turk at his sole will and pleasure. . . . When the Turks disappear, what will they leave behind? Many bitter and unhappy homes, no laws, no institutions, no public works. I read in a history of the little state of Montenegro an account of a bridge which the late sovereign of that small but noble territory had projected, or I believe I may say actually executed, over a mountain stream. The historian said, small as this bridge might be, yet probably it is a more considerable work, as a work of peace and utility, than has ever been executed by the united force of the Ottoman Government and people. . . .

"We are told we are a school of sentiment. I ask how it happens that every historian in this country is strongly on our side—that men so widely differing in their accidents of character and opinion as Mr. Freeman, Mr. Froude, and Mr. Carlyle, and I believe I might add to them Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Green, and many more of those gentlemen who represent the historical school of England—share those opinions which have been expressed to us on this platform to-night?"

Lord Granville said, in the debate at the beginning of the session, "There were 5,500 persons murdered in Lebanon, and there were some 20,000 women and children wandering about in a state of starvation. The Governor of Damascus was executed. The Bulgarian massacres were crimes which Mr. Baring justly describes as the most heinous that have stained the history of the present century."

The Duke of Argyll said, "There are people who desire 'peace at any price,' but it is a price to be paid by others and not by themselves. Anything for a quiet life; but the quietness is to be for themselves, and not for others. That is a feeling of utter selfishness, and my belief is, that this policy will end in war. I find a note from Sir H. Bulwer (in 1860) to the Grand Vizier, in which he coolly lays down this principle to the Prime Minister of Turkey—that all reforms which the Turks could not understand

must be carried into effect by Europeans, and then he proceeds to say that the Turkish race is perfectly effete. There is not a single judge in Turkey who is not venal. . . . In the Christian provinces of Turkey its Government is nothing better than a Government of Bashi-Bazouks."

Lord Beaconsfield on this observed, "The noble duke has charged us with laying it down as a principle that in no circumstances could we advise coercion to be applied to Turkey. I listened in vain to my noble friend (Lord Derby) if he gave expression to so unqualified a dogma."

Lord Hartington said: "In the speech in the Guildhall, Lord Beaconsfield indulged in what I cannot help considering taunts towards Russia. I willingly admit that there were interspersed here and there expressions of great civility to Russia and her Government, but remember that something was said about an ultimatum being an ugly word, when an ultimatum had just been presented by Russia to the Porte, and something also about an ultimatum being a proceeding like bringing an action when the debt had been paid into court. . . . If, for the security of our Indian Empire it should be our fortune to contend against the forces of nature, and against the laws of human progress, then I say we shall have undertaken a task which will prove beyond our powers of accomplishment. There is no power which can restore the sap and vigour to the lifeless trunk, and there is no power which can check the growth of the living, although struggling, tree. The Turkish domination is the lifeless trunk, the struggling nationalities are the living tree, and this House is asked to-night to assert that with these nationalities, and not with the remnant of a shameful past, are the sympathies of the British nation."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated, "I cannot put the smallest confidence in any Constitution of that kind affording a remedy for the evil which you have to deal with."

Lord Derby said, "I do not lay much stress, any more than the noble earl opposite, upon the new Constitution of the Porte. I frequently warned the Austrian Government as to the manner

in which Austrian volunteers were crossing the frontier and entering Herzegovina. I was much impressed by a suggestion thrown out by Midhat Pasha at the Conference that the Porte should be allowed a reasonable time to consider what had been suggested, and if within that reasonable time, whatever it might be, nothing was done, he considered that so far as he was concerned the Powers would have a right to demand guarantees." Even Midhat Pasha, therefore, admits that eventually the Powers would have a right to use coercion, but the English Turcophile Government thinks that never so long as the world lasts shall we be justified in using coercion.

Twelve years ago he made this telling statement, "I believe the breaking up of the Turkish Empire to be only a question of time, and probably not a very long time. The Turks have played their part in history; they have had their day, and that day is over, and I confess I do not understand, except it be from the influence of old diplomatic traditions, the determination of your older statesmen to stand by the Turkish rule, whether right or wrong. I think we are making for ourselves enemies of races which will very soon become, in Eastern countries, dominant races, and I think we are keeping back countries by whose improvement we, as the great traders of the world, would be the great gainers; and that we are doing this for no earthly advantage, present or prospective. I admit that England has an interest, and a very strong one, in the neutrality of Egypt, and some interest, also, though to a less extent, in Constantinople not falling into the hands of a great European Power; but, these two points set aside, I can conceive no injury arising to Great Britain from any transfer of power which might affect the Turkish Empire."

The Earl of Dudley remarked, "I am one of those who, up to this time, have had faith in what was declared to be the Imperial policy at Moscow. Turkey is faithless and bankrupt, and no relations should be held with her until the wrongs of her Christian people are redressed. The peace of Europe is a secondary consideration, so far as this country is concerned. The first and main one is, that the Christian subjects of the Porte should be more

fairly governed, and that the undertaking about to be given should not pass on the bare promise that reforms will be carried out."

The Marquis of Bath said, "If peace can only be secured by leaving the Christian populations of Turkey under that horrible Government, and in that wretched condition in which we know they are at present, I doubt much whether peace is worth preserving at that price."

Mr. Forsyth said, "In Turkey no crop can be gathered until the tax-gatherer has levied one-eighth of the value of the produce, and in Nevesinge (Herzegovina) the tax-gatherer did not come to exact the tithe until January, 1875. The peasants, to save themselves from starvation, had in the meantime gathered in a portion of their crops. There is no doubt that there was a strong sympathy for the insurgents felt by the Slavonic population of Russia and Austria; but I defy any one to prove that this disposition has been fomented by Austrian or Russian intrigue. . . ."

Mr. Evans, in his "Tour through Bosnia," says, "In the heat of summer men are stripped naked and tied to a tree, smeared over with honey or other sweet stuff, and left to the tender mercies of the insect world. For winter extortion it is found convenient to bind people to stakes, and leave them barefooted to be frost-bitten, or at other times they are shoved into a pig stye, and cold water poured on them. A favourite plan is to draw a party of Rayahs up a tree or into a chamber, and then smoke them with green wood. . . . The Bosnians are of a temperament admirably fitted for Parliamentary Government; and what is more, owing to their still preserving the relics of the free institutions of the primitive Slavs, they are familiar with its machinery. In their family communities, in their village councils, the first principles of representative government are practised every day."

Lord E. Fitzmaurice said, "It has been said that the rebellion was got up by foreign emissaries. Was there ever a rebellion of which this has not been said? But assume—and I do not deny that foreigners have entered these countries, men of the same religion and nationality, though owning a different political allegiance—what stronger argument can be used against the

Turkish Government? Imagine foreign emissaries coming to stir up a rebellion in England. They would speedily find their way to the nearest horse-pond, but in Turkey they were welcomed."

Mr. Holms said, "Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Sidney Herbert believed that the British forces and their ally were to take Sebastopol in a few days. Lord Raglan and Admiral Dundas were of the same opinion, and formed strange estimates of the Russian forces—the one estimating them at 30,000, and the other at 120,000 men. The commerce of Turkey had greatly diminished in our case to the amount of 23 per cent., whilst Russia could show a mile of railway for every £10,000 she had borrowed."

Sir H. Elliott wrote, "The Porte has never intimated an intention of disarming the Christians." But notwithstanding this, Her Majesty's Government, more Turkish than the Turks, rush into the field, and say this is a thing we cannot hear of, for a collision will be certain to ensue. They therefore proposed that one side (the Christian) should be disarmed and that it should then go into the presence of an armed (Mahometan) population.

Sir W. Vernon Harcourt stated, "The Government of Turkey is a Government tempered by assassination and maintained by massacre. What a spectacle did those Sultans offer to the world—a dynasty of worn-out and impotent debauchees, who let loose on mankind a horde of uncontrollable wild beasts. They could no longer accept complicity with such a detestable and detested Government—an abominable and abominated race. The handwriting of Belshazzar was already flaming on their walls. They had been weighed in the balance of European opinion and their scale had kicked the beam. For four centuries they had been the curse of Europe, Africa, and Asia. They had occupied the finest portions of the globe—the famous cities of the East—the cradles of genius and art; but, where their hoofs had trodden, the grass had never grown. Those famous spots, so dear to the memories of mankind, were now the haunts of wild beasts, of which the worst were those who bore a human form. What reason was there to allege that in this matter the conduct of Russia had been

wanting in moderation? Indeed, considering her national sympathies and the terrible nature of the provocation, it seemed to him that her self-restraint had been astonishing."

Vice-Consul Dupuis wrote from Adrianople, "Judicial torture, as your excellency is aware, is a common practice in connection with judicial proceedings now going on against Bulgarian political prisoners. . . . It is proved that in many cases they (the Turks) fired from the train on inoffensive Bulgarian labourers, and at Adakem two women and a man were wounded while attending to their work in the fields. . . . The wife of Nicholas Kozam, who had been confined, was killed with her four children, an old woman, and a servant girl. Their bodies were, I was told, subsequently found in a well, that of the baby horribly gashed. The wife of Christo Isantchoff was killed as well as her two daughters, one of whom had not long been confined of twins; both babies, together with one of the children of the second daughter, were cut into pieces. Pope Peter Patcharatoff was put into the poluse—a sort of cupboard where it is impossible to stretch one's limbs, and sleep is out of the question—for five days."

With reference to the working of the ridiculous Turkish Constitution, the *Times* writes as follows:—

"The issue has dissipated any hopes of equality or fraternity formed by the Christians. . . . The crucial test was furnished by the Bill on the Vilayets—that is, on the administration of the provinces. That measure, of Ministerial origin, provided that the local councils should consist half of Mahometans and half of non-Mahometans, whatever the number of inhabitants in the district represented. If only a tenth part were Mahometans, as is the case in some places, that tenth would balance the other nine-tenths in the council; and if, through the divisions of its opponents, it could bring over a single member, it would possess a majority. Thus on the very brink of a war occasioned by the oppression of a religious caste, and in the face of the positive enactment of the Constitution, these incorrigible Turks deliberately re-asserted the supremacy of their own people and the subjection of the Chris-

tians in every province of the Empire. The Christian members protested, but in vain. They were outvoted and silenced. The Chamber is now practically as much a Mahometan assembly as any delegation of the Softas themselves."

And it further gave, on April 6th, the following account of the way in which this sham Constitution protects the rights and liberties even of Mussulmans :—

"It is my painful duty to send you the report of a recent atrocity perpetrated by the Turkish Government in the capital itself. The young students of the Military School, as I informed you, presented a petition to the Porte denouncing Midhat's banishment as unconstitutional, and soliciting his recall. The students were marshalled out into the school-yard and bidden to reveal the author of the petition. One of them, Ali Nasmi, a most promising pupil, aged 22, stepped forward and avowed himself guilty of the authorship. He was imprisoned and tried, and last week condemned to receive 200 blows with a stick on the soles of his feet. He died under the infliction, after receiving 105 blows.

"Other equally sad consequence of Midhat's disgrace are worth recording. Said Effendi, a writer in the *Mussarak*, is kept a prisoner, with a chain round his body and fetters on his feet, for denouncing the unconstitutionality of the Grand Vizier's exile. With respect to Kemal Bey, it seems that the Palace insists on his being condemned, and the sentence will soon be pronounced. One wonders what becomes of the liberty of the person, of opinion, of equal justice, and the trials with open doors. One wonders, above all things, what has become of the abolition of all inhuman bodily punishment, bastinado, &c., solemnly decreed in a hundred Imperial Firmans.

"The interest which attaches to the way in which the Turks will carry out their new Constitution gives importance to the elections for the first Ottoman Parliament which are now being held. These elections have just been finished in the vilayet of Adrianople, and the results have been such as fully to justify the distrust which the Bulgarians have felt for the Constitution from the very beginning. According to the 65th Article of the Constitution,

every 50,000 male inhabitants (*noufoussi-zukur*) of Ottoman nationality will return a member. As, however, it will be the duty of the first Parliament to pass an electoral law for the present elections the Government have fixed the number of members each vilayet has to return; while as regards the mode of their election they have decreed that the members of the Provincial Administrative and Judicial Councils should vote for them. Now, according to the law of these Councils, half of their members are Mussulmans, the other half being representatives of different non-Mussulman communities — Bulgarians, Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. They are summoned in this instance to vote on behalf of the inhabitants of the vilayet of Adrianople for eight members —four Mussulmans, and four non-Mussulmans. As the Turkish members of these Councils, in face of the internecine divisions of their non-Mussulman colleagues, could have it all their own way, they have returned four Mussulmans, two Greeks, one Bulgarian, and one Jew. There is one Bulgarian, be it remembered, for the whole Bulgarian population of this vilayet, which, at the lowest calculation, numbers more than 400,000 male inhabitants. According to the 65th Article of the Constitution, therefore, these 400,000 male Bulgarian inhabitants ought to have returned eight members instead of one. But this is not all. The Bulgarians, unlike the Greeks, Arminians, and other non-Mussulman races of Turkey, are not scattered over many vilayets, but are grouped in compact masses, in five only—in those of the Danube, Sophia, Adrianople, Monastir, and Salonica. We do not yet know the result of the elections in the other vilayets, but nothing leads us to suppose that a larger number of Bulgarian members will be sent by them; at the very utmost we may hope that two Bulgarians will be returned by each of the first two vilayets, and one by each of the last three. So it may be confidently predicted that the number of Bulgarian members in the first Turkish Chamber of Deputies will be between five and seven. Yet the Christian Bulgarians of Turkey in Europe number, at least, 2,000,000 *noufous* (male inhabitants), and ought, therefore, according to the Constitution, to have forty representatives in the Parliament.

It may be remarked that this will only be a temporary injustice, lasting only so long as the first Parliament lasts, and that as regards future elections, the Reform Bill which will be passed by the first Parliament will set the matter right. I doubt very much whether a Chamber of Representatives, elected under such conditions, will ever pass a good electoral law. But, even assuming that it will perform more than it promises, it may be observed that it is just because this first Session will have so many important matters to decide that the Bulgarians ought to have been properly represented. Nor is it only the number but also the quality of the men who are being returned that causes grave misgivings as to the benefits which the country is to derive from its Parliament. All the eight members for this vilayet, with one exception, are natives of Adrianople, and not the most brilliant natives either. The Greeks especially complain very much of the utter incapacity of the two men who have been elected as their representatives. The Turkish electors are now doing—possibly by superior attractions—what the Turkish Government did in 1868. At that time Ali Pasha had hit upon the happy thought of imposing upon the good faith of Europe by infusing as large a non-Mussulman element into the Councils of State (*Shuraï Devlet*) as was consistent with the principle of Mahometan preponderance. But to effect even this slight infusion with safety to the interests of the dominant class it was essential that the non-Mussulman members should be intellectually as insignificant as possible; accordingly the four divisions of the *Shuraï Devlet* were filled with nonentities, who often contributed to the enlivenment, if not to the enlightenment, of that most important assembly.

"This Constitution is the very opposite of a reform; its whole spirit is retrograde, and designed to consolidate the Moslem power at the expense of the Christians. It declares the *Cheri* to be the fundamental law of the empire, the Sultan to be the Sacred Caliph, the religion of the State Mahometan. It makes no provision for securing a Christian Administration in the Christian provinces; it makes provision for breaking up the Christian primary schools and substituting the Turkish language

for the Christian languages; it grants no religious liberty, but simply toleration of recognised communities; it does not open the army to Christians. The Iradé issued this week—we had been informed that the era of Iradés was over—opening the military schools to Christians, is a simple repetition of a similar one issued fifteen years ago, which was followed by the introduction of half a dozen boys into the school, when it was found that the plan would not work. This means no more, and was issued for European consumption, like the other.

"The Christians certainly have nothing to hope from the Parliament. According to the Constitution, the 5,000,000 Bulgarians ought to have fifty members in the new House; in fact, they have only four, and these practically appointed by Midhat Pasha. This is equality under the Constitution. The Constitution does not even promise any real improvement in general administration for the benefit of Moslems.

"The Sultan, the Grand Vizier, and the Sheïk-ul-Islam remain, as before, the irresponsible, absolute rulers of the country, with all the real power in their hands. The Senate is to be made up of old public functionaries—*i.e.*, of the same ignorant, corrupt officials who have been doing their best to ruin the Empire for the last twenty years. The House of Deputies will be two-thirds Moslem, and the members are chiefly petty officials, many of whom can neither read nor write. To attempt to improve the general condition of this country by the addition of the cumbrous and expensive machinery of a Parliament to an Administration which already suffers from the enormous development of the official class is the greatest absurdity ever thought of. Even Oliver Cromwell could not get a Parliament out of Puritan England which was not a curse to the country. Will Midhat do better in collecting together a herd of ignorant and fanatical Turkish officials, with a few almost equally ignorant and fanatical Christian sycophants?"

Truth says:—"The Turkish M.P.'s are freely called 'Eshek,' or ass, by the President, and are told to hold their tongues."

In Crete there are about 220,000 Christians to 40,000 Mussul-

mans; yet the Turks have as many representatives in the sham Constitution. They were promised remission of taxes and that some part of the revenue should be spent on local improvements, but this has not been done; nor are Christians and Mussulmans equal before the law.

Then again as to Turkish Finance, the *World* says, "If the Turkish Government had shown a little more common honesty in its dealings with its English creditors, it would have been in every way better off at the present moment. . . . Credit is as useful as capital any day, and the lack of it Turkey is now destined to discover. Ludhi Effendi is said to be coming over here on a borrowing expedition. We cannot imagine that anyone will be insane enough to lend him anything. . . . The bondholders of 1871 are even now trying hard to get possession of funds which have actually been remitted from Egypt (as part payment of its tribute to Turkey) on their account, but which are withheld by the dishonesty of Turkish financiers. While such a piece of rascality as this is being committed at the expense of Englishmen, who have already lent their money to the Porte, with what face can an agent of that Government make his appearance here and ask for a new loan? If English investors refused to lend a shilling to any foreign Government for ten years to come . . . we should not then see again such an insolent mendicant at our doors as the Turkish Government, clutching with one hand the money which belongs to its creditors, and holding out the other to beg for more.

"The Turks, in order to obtain fresh money in the English market, have since released the funds in the Bank of England of the tribute loan, but only on levying £178,000 as black mail."

Mr. Gladstone thus sarcastically depicts the conduct of Turkey to her creditors:—

"Turkey, in 1875, determined to pay her creditors only half the interest due to them, and in 1876 a new minister of the most enlightened type said that the edict which ordained that half should be paid had offended the moral sense of the country, and therefore it should be repealed. The effect of that was that

none was paid at all. I understand that what is called the Turkish Parliament contemplates that the first rate of interest to be paid, including sinking fund, would be 1 per cent. on the capital received." . . .

Forty years ago Mr. Cobden thus wrote of the Turks: "Probably in nothing has this people been more unduly represented than in the praises which have been bestowed on their unrestricted principles of trade. The Turk knows nothing and cares as little about freedom of commerce—he disdains trade himself, and despises it in others; and if he has failed to imitate more civilized nations (though in this point of view not wiser) by fortifying his coasts with custom-houses, it is certainly from no wise principle of taxation, but simply because such a circuitous method of fiscal taxation would be far too complicated and wearisome for the minds of Ottoman governors, who prefer the simple mode of raising a revenue by the direct extortion of the Pasha or the Aga."

Mehemet Kuprisli Pasha, an intelligent Turk, formerly Minister at Berlin and London, acknowledged to Mr. Senior that Turkey was without "a single real road, except a bit about five miles long which the French made for us." How hopeless it is to expect a population to grow in wealth and comfort under such a system of government may be gathered from the following incidents:—

"Captain Ward, an Englishman, rented, at a distance of about twelve miles from Constantinople, 4,000 acres of land; the soil was of the finest description; the rent only £70 a year. Captain Ward spent from £3,000 to £4,000 in cultivating and improving the property, but the want of roads nullified all his efforts. He was unable to bring his produce to market, for it was more costly to move a quarter of grain from a distance of twenty miles in the interior of Turkey to Constantinople than it was to convey it from London to that port."

In the preface to an interesting little book, which has just been issued, and the author of which (Mr. Barkley) is a civil engineer, who was for some years employed on the construction of a railway between the Danube and the Black Sea—we find a statement made which so strikingly illustrates the misery and misrule

which exists under this Turkish system of "commercial enlightenment" that we cannot refrain from quoting it.

"About twelve miles from Varna, and not far off the route to Shumla, is the flourishing village of Gebedji, which is partly Turkish, partly Bulgar. On entering it, one is at once struck by the appearance of prosperity exhibited in the well-built houses and large flocks of cattle. Between this village and the road is a swamp with a narrow but deep brook running through it. To assist in the construction of the line, which passed by the village, I caused a road to be made across the marsh, and a wooden bridge thrown over the brook. The first night after the bridge was completed it was cut down; and on making inquiries about it, a Turk told me that rather than live with this easy access to the road, the inhabitants, both Turks and Bulgars, would burn their houses and migrate to some spot where Turkish officials, Turkish troops, and, above all, Turkish Zaptiehs (policemen) could not so easily get at them."

The government of Turkey is nothing but an organised system of corruption and robbery. Intelligent Turks themselves know and acknowledge this to be the case. Achmed Veofic Effendi, Minister of Justice at Constantinople in 1857, said to Mr. Senior, "With us government is supposed to exist for the benefit, not of the governed, but of the governors." Violence, extortion, treachery, and fraud are the characteristic features of a modern Turkish administration. The highest offices of the state are bought and sold, and if by chance one Turkish statesman is found occasionally to make an effort to resist the contagion of corruption, the chances are that he is sacrificed at once by some political or harem intrigue, and ends his days in poverty and obscurity.

Another of Mr. Senior's correspondents says:—"The Turk is utterly unimprovable. He hates change, and he hates civilization; he hates Europeans—he hates and fears all that they propose. There is not a word in the Hatti Humáyoon that does not disgust, or irritate, or alarm him. Nothing but force will oblige him to give to it the appearance of execution. And what is the value of apparent reforms in a people without an aristocracy,

without a middle-class, without a public opinion, without the means of communication, without newspapers, without even a post-office, accustomed for 400 years to plunder and oppress Rayahs, and to be oppressed and plundered by sultans, pashas, cadis, and janissaries?"

As to the capacity of Bulgaria and Bosnia for freedom, writing from Adrianople in 1867, Vice-Consul Blunt said:—"As far as my experience goes, I consider the Bulgarians to be, on the whole, a shrewd, active, and industrious people, ranking in capacity and intelligence with any other of the European races. They require only the full development of their good qualities for attaining a high accomplishment in modern civilisation. The aspirations of the younger and more impartial generation have for the present no other political purport than to place the Bulgarian nationality on the same footing with the remainder of the Christian communities of the Ottoman Empire."

Mr. Monson says, "I have been told to day that the body of a man who was ransomed was handed over to the peasant who went to fetch it and hacked to pieces, and that the Turks admit that they tortured him for two days by tearing out his finger-nails, an atrocity which is proved, it is said, by the condition of the corpse, and they executed two Herzegovinian refugees whom they employed to obtain provisions for their troops."

M. Ristich, Servian Minister for Foreign Affairs, said, "The Ottoman army, though the Servian population has nowhere opposed any resistance to the invasion, has burnt, pillaged, and sacked everywhere on its passage. All the villages which it has passed are reduced to ashes and the churches have been shelled. The Tcherkesse and the Bashi Bazouks were organized into bands of incendiaries. Each squad is composed of four armed men, and a fifth who carries bottles of petroleum. In many instances they have carried off women and girls, whose fate is unknown. Among the prisoners taken by us at Widdin are twelve convicts snatched from the galleys for the army. After the combat of Velike Tzvor, Colonel Leschianine ordered the Servian troops to proceed to bury the dead. Osman Pasha refused to receive the

flag of truce sent to arrange this. The corpses of both camps remain unburied."

Consul Reade says, "So slight was the cord with which one of the insurgents was executed by the Turks that it broke three times, and it did not break the fourth time solely from the unfortunate man being in fact partly held up by several of the military; the intense suffering of the wretched man may be imagined. The other two who suffered were most inhumanly treated by their executioners, who appeared to be gloating over their revolting task by making use of the most shocking expressions and gestures to every Bulgarian Christian they met."

Consul Brophy says Chefket Pasha massacred the Bulgarians of Boyadjak, who, in the words of a Mussulman present, said they allowed themselves to be slaughtered like sheep; out of two thousand men, women, and children only about fifty escaped."

Mr. Baring says there is only a train to Yamboli three times a week, and that "the Turkish authorities purposely fostered dissensions between them (the Bulgarians) and the Greeks; that the overcrowding of the prisons at Philippopolis was terrific, 250 men were confined for four days in a bath in which there was not the smallest attempt at drainage, the stench becoming so fearful that the guards could not even sit in the ante-room but had to stay in the street; that a priest declared to him that he was confined for seven days in a privy, during three of which he had neither food nor water, and for twenty-one days in the polizzi, already alluded to, where it is impossible to sleep.

"At Peroustitza the number of killed was three hundred, and the official report says most of those committed suicide (I suppose to save themselves, like St. Patrick's frogs, from slaughter), the fact being that one man did."

"There is no doubt that numbers of women were violated on the road. Some of the women I saw sitting on the ruins of their houses singing the most melancholy sort of dirge, others wandered about the churchyard among the corpses, while a few who seemed more than half bereft of reason, rushed about tearing their hair, beating their brows, and uttering piercing shrieks." These deeds

were committed not only by Bashi-Bazouks, but also by regulars, the Arab soldiers in particular distinguishing themselves by their licentiousness and cruelty.

Fasli Pasha arrested two men totally unconnected with the revolution, he then indulged freely in drinking, and ordered the prisoners to be hung immediately; the Tabour Agace refused to carry this order out unless the Pasha gave it in writing, upon which he was placed under arrest, another officer was called up, and the men were hung. The next morning, it is said, the Pasha asked to have the prisoners brought before him.

The people of Bellova have now sixty oxen. A Government order comes for eighty; only half this number is forthcoming, and the soldiers on their arrival beat the people. The Circassians have lived by robbery ever since they have been in the country. The "Soultans" have taken away the land of their neighbours. They also impose forced labour on the rayahs, and otherwise annoy them.

The Ulema, or ministers of religion and professors of law, pay no taxes, their property is hereditary, their persons are sacred, their blood may on no account be shed, nor can they be punished legally in any way but by imprisonment and exile.

Consul Holmes reports that the firman directing the tax in lieu of military service on non-Mussulman subjects of the Porte should be levied between the ages of twenty and forty, has been repealed, and henceforward it will be levied between the ages of fifteen and seventy-five. He adds, "Sultan Hamid is supposed by the Mussulmans to be of a firm and resolute disposition, averse to any reforms in favour of the Christians of the Empire.

Another instance of Turkish inconsistency and oppression is that the Sheik-ul-Islam* has proclaimed a holy war against the infidel, whilst the Sultan has imposed compulsory service on the Christians!

The *Times* says:—"Before the battle of the 16th inst., in which the Russians were successful, a Turkish commander knew so little of the neighbouring ground that he begged our correspondent to

* Since deposed.

make a sketch of an important pass; and the army was so badly posted and led that it was cut to pieces. The Turkish general did not know what 'strategy' meant, and in the right wing of the army there was but one officer 'fit to command a corporal's guard.' The Kurdish irregulars are said to be a cowardly, cruel, and useless rabble. Mukhtar Pasha caused this morning two regimental officers to be degraded and flogged in the citadel of Erzeroum for want of gallantry."

There have been constant ministerial changes in Turkey in recent years, the average term of service of the members of the Divan not amounting to more than four months.

Whilst the Turcophiles pretend that the Sultan could not have allowed reforms carried on under foreign auspices without sacrificing the independence of the Empire and raising a storm of indignation amongst the Mussulman population, Consul Calvert writes (December 17th, 1876):—

"I have now seen all the local 'Beys' or Turkish landowners. They every one comment strongly on the wretched state to which the population at large has been reduced through Ottoman misgovernment, and which has caused the discontent that has brought the country to its present pass. One Bey, without any leading question on my part, volunteered confidentially his opinion on this subject as follows:—

"'The best remedy,' he said, 'for these evils would be for the foreign Powers to insist on the association of an experienced European in the administration of the province, with power to control all abuses.'

"He made this remark as an original idea of his own, and apparently in ignorance that anything of the sort had been projected by the Western Powers.

"I must add that whilst all spoke strongly regarding the existing evils, they insisted that the Moslems are worse off than the Christians, especially in that the latter are exempted from the conscription. They added that they would gladly pay the military exemption tax many times over to obtain the same privilege.

"The Beys, with hardly an exception, reside now in the pro-

vincial towns, only visiting their estates occasionally; they have no country seats. So far from asserting towards the Government any will or opinion of their own, they even obsequiously watch for the cue which is given them as occasion may require."

We all know the story of the drummer who was flogging a soldier, who not unnaturally complained; upon which the drummer said to him, "There is no pleasing you, whether I flog high or low; you continually find fault;" and so the Turks appear to think the Christians most unreasonable. They diversify as much as possible the tortures they inflict on them. They try impaling, tearing out their eyes, ripping up women with child, violation, and the most ingenious and novel forms of cruelty. But the Christians are still not satisfied. Here is another specimen from the dispatch of Consul Calvert:—

"The most general form of torture was as follows: The prisoner was hung up with an iron collar round his neck, attached to a chain passed through a ring let into one of the beams above. The end of this chain was pulled by zaptiehs, and the prisoner lifted up until one toe barely touched the ground. This treatment was occasionally varied by keeping him suspended altogether. The collar catching the sufferers under the chin, prevented actual strangulation, and they were kept in these positions till they swooned. These proceedings were conducted in person by the Yuzbashi Suleiman Aga, who, during the process of hanging up, kept beating the unfortunate men unmercifully, sometimes with a stick of ordinary size, sometimes with a knotted cudgel as thick as one's wrist, calling out at every blow, 'Speak, then, speak!' The hands of the victims were sometimes manacled, sometimes free; but in all cases, whenever they raised them in the attempt to ease the strain on their necks, they were struck over the hands to make them desist. A certain Abdullah Tchaousch, a zaptieh sergeant, is stated to have been, next to the Yusbashi himself, the most zealous actor in these doings.

"The priests came in for an extra share of ill-usage. Four of them were fastened by the neck to an iron hoop, and were made to move round in a circle, and were flogged as they did so. They

were left for a whole night fastened to this hoop, in which position it was impossible for them to lie down. Among these priests was Pop Petko, of Yeni-kioï, who appears to have been subjected to greater cruelty and brutality than any of the others. In his case and that of Pop Ivan, of Kravenick (who was one of those attached to the hoop), an additional form of torture was employed. The temples and jaws of these unfortunate men were pressed by an iron instrument till their eyes almost started from their heads, and their teeth were so loosened that in the case of Pop Petko one of them fell out. During this process they were repeatedly told to declare what they knew. On the last occasion, when Pop Petko was hung up, the torture was prolonged to no less than twenty-four hours, during which time he was altogether lifted off the ground four times for spaces varying from half-an-hour to one hour. The priests were plucked by the beard and hair as they were hanging. One day the Yusbashi's son, a lad fifteen or sixteen years old, fell upon Pop Petko most savagely, knocking him down, garotting him till the blood came from his throat, and plucking out the hairs of his beard and head by handfulls. Again, being placed near the door, which opened upon the courtyard, a person from outside one day dealt him so violent a blow on the ear that it suppurated, and he was deaf for many days afterwards. His legs, when they were released, were swollen to twice their size, and his health was so shattered by all these brutalities that he was confined to his bed for months after his release."

"A zaptieh arrived in the village of Brankortsi, in Bulgaria, on last Christmas Day. He wished to be quartered upon one Petko, because that man had two young and pretty daughters who would be obliged to wait upon him. But the *cmet*, the village head-man, said this could not be, as two Albanians had been already placed at Petko's house; whereupon the zaptieh beat the *cmet*, which was received as in the ordinary course of things. But the zaptieh did not stop there. He stabled his horse, and came out with bridle, saddle, and saddle-bags, and actually bridled and harnessed and then mounted the terrified and unre-

sisting *cmet*. The wretch rode his 'man-horse' up and down the street, forcing him into puddles where the mud was deepest. When they came to the house which the *cmet* had destined for the zaptieh's residence, the rider pulled up, alighted, and was soon surrounded by the villagers, all aghast at the sight of the strange equestrian group, *yet never daring to interfere or remonstrate*. The zaptieh bade the landlord bring out an armful of hay, and as the man ventured to intercede for the poor *cmet*, the zaptieh struck him in the face with so heavy a blow as to stretch him almost senseless on the ground. The 'man-horse' was brought up, tied by his rider to a post outside the door, and, whip in hand, bidden to eat the hay. The poor man, now thoroughly unmanned, and bathing that forage with his tears, tried to comply with the brutal order, and took some of the hay between his teeth."

Brigadier-General Williams, in a despatch addressed to Lord Clarendon from Erzeroum on February 6th, 1855, says:—"The buying and selling of slaves by the officers of the Kars army, is as notorious as any other malpractices on their part. Boys are preferred by those brutes, and the girls are sent to Constantinople; and until the allied consuls are authorised to demand the restitution of these victims to Turkish sensuality, and are provided with funds to send them back to their families in Georgia; and until the Porte is bound by treaty to send the culprits so detected to the galleys for a certain specified time, this infamous traffic will flourish; and all which has been said, or may be written, about abolitionary firmans, simply adds mockery to crime and woe. When I saw Mustapha Pacha quit the camp at Kars, and fawn upon the soldiers drawn out in line to salute him who had robbed and starved them, he was closely followed, and that at noon-day, by two Georgian slaves under an escort of regular cavalry. They had been bought the day previous to his departure, and this traffic was notorious throughout the camp. Your lordship may therefore infer that, had the Turks penetrated into Georgia last campaign, very few youths of either sex would have escaped pollution; and I feel bound to tell your lordship my

opinion on this most interesting subject, which is, that if England does not effectually repress this trade by stringent treaty, Russia will accomplish it by her arms; that is, if peace leave her in possession of Georgia."

The reader should remember that this was the testimony, not of an anti-slavery emissary, or even of a subject Christian, but of a commander who had fought gallantly for the Turks, and whose name will be remembered by posterity as that of the "Hero of Kars."

Vice-consul Brophy writes, "The murder of the shepherd of Tellakem was perpetrated because he refused to give some Turks sixty sheep or their value. His body was found with the jaw-bone smashed and the teeth all knocked out. A knife had been passed through the throat, not so as to cut it thoroughly, but to stick him like a pig."

M. Ristich, Minister of Servia, says, "The country has been systematically ravaged, the fields are laid waste, whole villages delivered to the flames. . . During the battle of the 22nd of August before Alexinatz, they fired on an ambulance until they saw the red flag disappear. Some Turkish horsemen having met the Secretary of the Red Cross Committee of Alexinatz in the exercise of his duty, rushed upon him. First, they cut off the arm which bore the badge, then they cut the cross itself from this unhappy man's arm, who expired in the most horrible torments." In an enclosure, M. Ristich sends a declaration from seven inhabitants of Bulgaria: "We are forced to be present at the dishonour of our daughters, who are ravished under our eyes, and who fall victims to the vile passions of the Turks. Our children are carried off into slavery and forced to embrace the Mahometan religion. Those who resist are mercilessly slaughtered; our wives are ripped up, and the children cut out of their bodies with the sword; our houses are set on fire, our cattle carried off, our churches desecrated and destroyed."

Colonel Horvatovitch states, "Bodies have been thrown into the wells, and wherever there was drinking water. In the streets a body was found, and the legs were entirely flayed from the thighs

to the feet. Govko Kaissia was tortured and killed in his house by a red hot iron."

M. Durando tells us in the Italian Green Book :—"In relating their griefs, the state of nudity and of privation of their families wandering among the rocks, these men shed floods of tears."

Mr. W. E. Forster, M.P., told Sir H. Elliott, "Although there was no rising here (in the Dobroudja) the Bashi Bazouks and the Circassians have committed the same horrors as everywhere else. As elsewhere they *violated girls over ten years old* and women; other children they cut in pieces and burnt in sight of the mothers. . . These scenes, worthy of cannibals, were repeated in other villages. . . At Silistria many bodies have been seen in the Danube, and these bodies have been recognised to be those of the poor Bulgarians who were arrested . . all these corpses had their hands tied behind their backs. . . A Bulgarian peasant being one day with his wife, his son, his daughter-in-law, and some children in the field, the Turk, accompanied by some fellow-countrymen all armed to the teeth, came upon them suddenly, first killed the men by disembowelling them, afterwards violated the women, and finally cut their throats as well as the children's. To this day the assassins walk freely about and boast of their exploit. The Ottoman authorities do not stir a finger. They think this horrible atrocity appropriate, for it only affects Ghiaours."

The atrocities of the Turks, to use the expression of a French writer, are "crimes peut-etre inconnues aux enfers"; they spare neither men in their anger, nor women in their lust.

To show with what chivalrous magnanimity Prince Nicholas of Montenegro carries on the war against the Turks, in spite of their barbarous conduct to the Montenegrins, I quote what Mr. Monson writes from Cettigne on October 5, 1876: "Prince Nicholas is very anxious to show by every means in his power that he knows how to carry on the war with courtesy towards the enemy.

"The Grand Vizier having requested permission to send provisions into Medun during the late war, His Highness replied that he would do that himself on condition that he might be allowed

to verify the number of the garrison, although he knew that the fortress was reduced to such straits that it must soon surrender from famine.

"Again, Osman Pasha having told Mr Stillman that his health was affected by the monotony of his life at Cettigne, the Prince at once allowed him three weeks leave of absence to go to Ragusa for change of air, and supplied him with a sum of money far more than enough to pay his expenses handsomely."

As to Turkish slavery, I have to observe, in former times a "good middling" Circassian girl was *worth* £100.

Mr. Joseph Cooper, hon. secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, in his recent pamphlet, "Turkey and Egypt, Past and Present, in Relation to Africa," estimates that the number of negroes annually taken from Africa, chiefly for the supply of Turkey and Egypt, is over 70,000, but that for every slave who reaches his destination five die *en route*, or are killed in the savage warfare which takes place in the effort to capture them.

"In mutilating the negroes for the harems, two out of three," says Major Millingen, "die under the operation."

A good female cook fetches £75 at Constantinople, and sometimes as much as £1,000 is given for a Circassian beauty.

Fuad Pasha, in a letter to Professor Lavelaye in 1868, said that "the abolition of slavery was a principle to which the Turkish Government adheres with its whole heart," yet Major Millingen says, "a wife of Fuad Pasha, in common with other great ladies of Stamboul, was well known as an extensive trader in Circassian beauties."

At the beginning of the last century, as quoted by Mrs. Millicent Garrett Fawcett, Lady Mary Wortley Montague wrote:—"We crossed the deserts of Servia, almost quite overgrown with wood in a country naturally fertile. The inhabitants are industrious; but the oppression of the peasants is so great that they are forced to abandon their houses and neglect their tillage; all they have being a prey to the janissaries whenever they please to seize upon it. We had a guard of 500 of them, and I was almost in tears to see their insolences to

the poor villages through which we passed. . . . Indeed the janissaries had no mercy on their (the peasants') poverty, killing all the poultry and sheep they could find, without asking to whom they belonged. . . . When the pachas travel it is yet worse."

More than twelve years ago, our ambassador at Constantinople, a well-known Turcophile, Sir Henry Bulwer, recorded the following opinion of the permanent characteristics of Turkish rule: —"Wherever the Turk is sufficiently predominant to be implicitly obeyed, laziness, corruption, and extravagance mark his rule; and wherever he is too feeble to exert more than a doubtful and nominal authority, the system of government which prevails is that of the Arab robber and the lawless Highland chieftain."

If there be one person in England likely to be a favourable witness for Turkey, it is Mr. Layard; and yet here is his description of what he himself saw of the treatment of the unfortunate Nestorian Christians in Kurdistan:—"Their church was in ruins —around were the charred remains of the burnt cottages, and the neglected orchards overgrown with weeds. A body of Turkish troops had lately visited the village, and had destroyed the little that had been restored since the Kurdish invasion. The same taxes had been collected three times, and even four times over. The relations of those who had run away to escape from the exactions had been compelled to pay for the fugitives. *The chief had been thrown, with his arms tied behind his back, on a heap of burning straw, and compelled to disclose where a little money that had been saved by the villagers had been buried. The priest had been torn from the altar, and beaten before his congregation. Men showed me the marks of torture on their body, and of iron fetters round their limbs. For the sake of ringing a few piastres from this poverty-stricken people, all these deeds of violence had been committed by officers sent by the Porte to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan, whom they pretended to have released from the misrule of the Kurdish chiefs.*"

The *Times* correspondent with the Turkish army in Asia reluctantly states:—"Arriving in the country a strong Philo-Turk,

deeply impressed with the necessity of preserving 'the integrity of the Empire,' in order to uphold 'British interests,' I now fain would cry with Mr. Freeman, 'Perish our Indian interests rather than one English soldier should fall fighting for Turkey.' . . . After accompanying a Turkish army in the field, after witnessing the privations of the men owing to the criminally faulty commissariat arrangements; after seeing the miseries of the wounded untended and uncared for; after hearing of, as well as seeing the oppression habitually exercised on Christians by all Mahomedans. . . . . I cannot help feeling that she is past redemption, and that any encouragement given her will only prolong the present struggle, afford Russia a pretext for further aggression, and make the blow, when it does come, fall harder upon the misguided nation."

The editors and compositors of the Turkish newspapers *Selamet* and *Massavat* have been exiled and the publication of these journals suspended for articles urging the removal of Redif Pasha. A forced loan of five millions has been voted to be obtained by an anticipatory collection of double taxes and of ordinary revenue. When the Chamber of Deputies demanded explanations from the War Minister, he refused to appear.

With reference to the conduct of the Montenegrins to the Turkish wounded and prisoners, I now append the following portion of a dispatch from Prince Nicholas. The Prince of Montenegro says :—

"I observe with pleasure that the Government of her Majesty the Queen does justice to my personal feelings in this respect, and this impression, sir, will certainly have been confirmed by your own reports. You have yourself been able to see how our prisoners are treated. In all we have had about a thousand, who have been fed, cared for, even clothed, and afterwards set at liberty. You have been in a position to compare our proceedings with those of the Turks, who have made no prisoners, or have only kept them a few days to behead them afterwards, as you will have been informed by some of your fellow countrymen, eye-witnesses of such deeds in Mouktar Pasha's camp.

"I regret to find in your letter nothing indicating the special cases of cruelty which have been brought to the knowledge of the English Ambassador at the Sublime Porte.

"In the absence of all information on this point, I must presume that certain wounded are referred to of whom mention has been made in the papers, and who have been exhibited in the hospitals of Constantinople, whither they had been conveyed from Albania. Now these same men, to the number of seven, have, at the request of the Vali, been inspected in the ambulances at Scutari by the European Consuls, who have borne witness to their noses having been mutilated; but at that time there was no question of prisoners being impaled and others cut to pieces alive or slashed with knives; all these horrors were added after the wounded had been conveyed to the capital and exposed to view there.

"Certainly, I was very indignant and angry upon learning that our auxiliaries the Kutchi had treated in such a way soldiers left for dead on the field of battle, and I gave most strict orders that such acts should not be repeated. From the commencement of the war I have neglected no means to induce our people to renounce the barbarous habits which they had been taught by their adversaries themselves.

"In the late actions, the latter have not rendered this task an easy one, for, from the first day of active hostilities, the heads of twenty-two Montenegrins, beheaded alive, have been exposed by them on the bridge of Podgoritza; and the Turkish Commander-in-Chief, personally, refused to give up these sinister trophies to four of our women who had the courage to go to him and claim them for interment.

"Besides this, the Orthodox Greek priest of one of our villages has been subjected by them to one of the tortures which they accuse us of having employed; they have hacked him to pieces alive with the sabre.

"Notwithstanding this, assisted by my officers, I have done all I can to prevent reprisals. The many strangers, including the Agents of various States, who have followed my head-quarters,

can attest how far I have succeeded; I leave myself in their hands.

"In every case, even in the most terrible moments of a mortal struggle of centuries, have the Montenegrins never allowed themselves to be carried away by the example of their enemies, so as to commit upon them the horrible cruelties of which the papers have spoken."

This statement is confirmed by the following dispatch from Consul Monson:—"With reference to my dispatch of the 4th instant, reporting a conversation which I had had with Prince Nicholas respecting the multilations of Turkish soldiers by Montenegrins, I have the honour to state that Colonel Thömmel informs me that he has addressed a full report to Count Andrassy upon this subject, upon which his presence at the Prince's headquarters during most of the campaign, and his acquaintance with the country for the last twenty years, enable him to speak with more authority than I can pretend to claim.

"I have reason, however, to believe that the gist of his opinion, formed from personal observation and the information of trustworthy individuals, is to the effect that comparatively little reproach on the score of inhumanity can fairly be made against the Montenegrins for their conduct in the recent combats; and that he substantially confirms the Prince's statements as I have reported them."

The rascality of the Turks in fabricating atrocities which they pretend were committed by the Montenegrins is shown by the following dispatch from Consul Monson:—"With reference to my dispatch of the 24th December last, inclosing copies of my correspondence with Prince Nicholas respecting the alleged mutilation of wounded Turks by Montenegrins, I have the honour to state that the 'Glas Czrnagora' of yesterday publishes a letter addressed by an inhabitant of Podgoritza to a friend at Cettigné, giving an account of the manner in which, by the order of Hussein Pasha, the faces of some of the unburied dead (Turkish soldiers) at Fundina had been recently mutilated and disfigured, in order to prove to three English surgeons that the charges of atrocities made against the Montenegrins were not unfounded."

Mr. Holms tells us that in 1865 our trade with European Turkey was £8,282,068; in 1875 it had fallen to £7,931,841; and our exports of British produce fell from £4,961,731 in 1865 to £3,630,365 in 1875, a decrease of more than 25 per cent.

The estimated expenditure of Turkey for 1875-6 was £23,143,000, exclusive of £9,500,000 for the insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and to meet this the nominal revenue is £19,106,000; but it was calculated that not more than £15,300,000 would be collected.

To show the financial effect of freeing a province from Turkish tyranny, it suffices to say, that Roumania, which in 1861 only took from us £196,000 worth of goods, in 1875 took from us goods to the amount of £1,163,231.

The words which that eloquent writer, De Maistre, uses towards an eminent sceptical writer, with a slight alteration, apply most aptly to the "Unspeakable Turk":—"He plunges into filth; he rolls himself in it, he saturates himself with it; he invents prodigies of horror—monstrosities which make the blood run cold; he abandons his imagination to the powers of darkness, which lend him all their strength to carry him to the furthest limits of evil. England applauds him, Sodom would have banished him."

A *Times* correspondent at Alexandria writes:—"Some three or four days ago I had occasion to visit on a matter of business one of the better class of Turkish officials, who has held at different times the positions of Governor of Alexandria, Minister of Foreign Affairs *ad interim*, and Minister of Justice. . . . A big map lay open before the Pasha, who pointed me out Kars with considerable pride. . . . A reference on my part to the presence of Sir Fenwick Williams at the former siege did not meet with the success I had expected. 'Very likely, very likely; there are Englishmen everywhere all over the place;' and another Turk present borrowed from Scripture an uncomplimentary comparison for my countrymen, and told me that 'the English went to and fro like Sheitan (Arabic for Satan) himself.' An unfortunate reference to Besika Bay brought upon me a fire of good-natured chaff (if it is not profane to apply such a term to the

pleasantry of sober Osmanlis). 'Why was the fleet going there?' repeated the Pasha. 'Because there was good shooting,' said one. 'Was it to protect the Christians?' asked another. 'Because they find we are getting on too well without them,' said a third. 'Because you want us more than we want you,' said a fourth. An Arab of the better fellah class said, 'Allah is great; the Murki (Russians) are damned; the English are soon to be all Mussulmans.'"

"The bearer of this paper (says the receipt for the tax) is a Christian, who has paid the capitulary contribution. He is permitted to wear his head on his shoulders during one year." The Hatti Humayoun (which means 'august writing') which was published in 1827 by Sultan Mahmoud, begins with these words:—"All reasonable men know that the Mussulman is the mortal enemy of infidels."

Major Russell, in his "Russian Wars with Turkey," quotes the following absurd language which, according to him, was uttered by Lord Palmerston:—"I much question that there is any process of decay now going on in the Turkish Empire. . . . All that we hear every day of the week about the decay of the Turkish Empire, and its being a dead body and a sapless trunk and so forth, is pure and unadulterated nonsense. I by no means think with you (Sydney Herbert) that he (the Emperor of Russia) will have an easy victory over the Turks. On the contrary, if the betting is not even, I would lay odds on the Turks! I do not believe in the disaffection of the Turkish provinces!"

The *Times*, writing from Shumla, says, "Every village is full of loungers. . . In the whole of the village I speak of, there were not, I should say, so many household utensils and comfort-giving articles as would be found in the poorest cottage in a Suffolk hamlet. Tables, chairs, cups, glasses, mugs are unknown. The mess is brought on to the ground in the cauldron it has been cooked in, and host and guests snatch from it with their fingers. Even an educated Turk writing a letter will take it off the table and finish it on the back of a book, or even holding it in his hand. It would be impossible to send the Turks out of Europe with bag and baggage, for practically they have neither.

"The spirit (of the Turks) is just what makes a soldier. They leave family and friends seemingly without a regret; the home sickness which depresses the conscripts of Christian armies appears to be unknown to them; they serve with a strange mixture of apathy and devotion, careless of *their own* lives, thoughtless of those they have left behind."

He might have added that there is probably not a single tooth-brush among the whole Ottoman population.

It seems never to occur to our thick-skulled and hard-hearted Turcomaniac wiseacres that if we went off on a wild-goose chase with our handful of soldiers to defend imaginary British interests in the East, the Germans might take the opportunity of seizing Holland, the French might annex Belgium, or another Indian mutiny might take place; but I suppose they think some 50,000 British troops are a match for any number of millions of the soldiers of other countries, and that we can easily beat the world in arms.

Suppose the Indian mutineers had had the "gumption" to rebel when we were engaged in the Crimean war, what would have become of our Indian Empire? While we were fighting with Russia to protect the supposed outworks of our Indian citadel, at the cost of the national disgrace of rivetting the chains of the Turk on the oppressed Christians, the fortress itself would probably have been irretrievably lost.

POLAND FROM A COMMON SENSE POINT OF VIEW.

A GREAT outcry is now raised by the Philo-Turkish party about the real and imaginary wrongs of Poland, as a set-off to the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria and elsewhere; but when Mr. Horsman, and other Liberals, brought the wrongs of Poland before the House of Commons, at the time when the Russian excesses were committed, the Conservative party were silent and indifferent, though it now suits their purpose to furbish up this blunt and rusty weapon; and some of the most violent partisans of Turkey are probably holders of Turkish non-dividend-paying Stocks, while I have never held a single bond, either of impecunious Turkey or dividend-paying and honest Russia.

Perhaps few are aware that in a preceding century the Poles invaded Russia, annexed great portions of that country, and imposed a Polish prince on the Russian throne, and that therefore there was a hostile feeling in Russia against Poland on that account. In addition to this, there was a continual state of anarchy in Poland; and in the seventeenth century Sweden conquered Poland, and held it in bondage for five years, and when the partition of Poland took place, it was not a Russian proposal at all; but the Russian Government, seeing that Prussia and Austria were determined to have a partition, decided that the least evil was to have its own share of the plunder.

To show what was the state of Poland before its partition, it suffices to quote the following account of it from Voltaire's "Life of Charles XII.":—"This great country is very fertile; but the people are, in consequence, so much the less industrious.

The workmen and merchants one sees in Poland are Scotchmen, Frenchmen, Jews especially. . . . This country remains poor, in spite of its abundance, because its people is enslaved, and because its nobility is proud and lazy. . . . Every gentleman has the right to give his vote in the election of a king, and to be one himself. . . . The throne is almost always at auction, and, as a Pole is seldom rich enough to buy it, it has been often sold to foreigners. The nobility and the clergy defend their liberty against their king, and take it away from the rest of the nation. All the people are slaves. . . . There the peasant does not sow for himself, but for the lord to whom he, his field, and the work of his hands belong, and who can sell him and cut his throat with the beasts of the earth. Every one who is a gentleman is his own master. It is necessary, to judge him in a criminal affair, to have an assembly of the whole nation; he can only be arrested after being condemned, consequently he is scarcely ever punished. . . . The nobility, jealous of its liberty, often sell its suffrages and rarely its affections. Scarcely have they elected a king when they fear his ambition, and oppose to him their cabals. . . . Every gentleman enjoys the right to oppose himself to the laws of the senate. A single gentleman who says, 'I protest,' arrests by this word alone the unanimous resolution of all the rest; and if he leaves the place where the Diet is held it must then separate."

Voltaire further tells us that there were about 100,000 of these tyrannical, indolent, factious and turbulent nobles, and that they did not even use their native language, but spoke Latin.

A few particulars of the dismal history of Poland may interest their new-found friends, the Philo-Turks. In 1079, King Boleslaus murdered St. Stanislaus, Bishop of Cracow, with his own hands. In 1164, Casimir II. invaded and conquered Prussia, which he placed under tribute. In 1296, King Premislas was assassinated. In 1349, Casimir the Great conquered Little Russia and Silesia; and in 1366 he took Red Russia from the Lithuanians. In 1498 the Wallachians invaded Poland, and carried off 100,000 Poles, whom they sold to the Turks as slaves.

In 1648, Casimir V. invaded the Ukraine, and ravaged it with fire and sword; and in 1668 this same prince, tired of the ingratitude and factiousness of the Poles, abdicated, in spite of their entreaties that he would remain their sovereign, and retired to a monastery in France, of which he became abbé, and where he would never allow himself to be called king. On the occasion of his abdication, he told the Polish Diet, more than a century before the first partition: "I foresee the misfortunes which threaten our country; please God that I may be a false prophet. The Muscovite and the Cossack will join themselves to the people who speak the same language as themselves, and will appropriate Lithuania; the boundaries of Great Poland will be open to Brandenburg; and Prussia herself will put forward treaties, or the right of conquest, to invade our territory. In the midst of this dismemberment of our states, the house of Austria will not let the opportunity escape of fixing its views on Cracow."

Other nations besides the Russians have treated the Poles with severity, and especially the Turks, whose cruelties to them I have related in the chapter on "The Unspeakable Turk." For instance, Voltaire tells us that the Swedes under Charles XII., when in Poland, in a certain district "seized all the peasants they could find; they obliged them to hang each other, and the last was forced to pass the rope around his own neck, and to be his own executioner. They burnt all their dwellings."

When the King of Poland himself foresaw and prophesied its partition, and when he proved by his abdication that it was impossible for the wisest, bravest, and best of princes to govern this anarchical and ungrateful nation, the only wonder is that the neighbouring states, who had been tormented for centuries by cruel and aggressive wars levied on them by the Poles merely to keep their turbulent nobility employed, did not extinguish the Polish volcano sooner.

In the middle of the seventeenth century the Cossacks of the Dnieper threw off their allegiance to Poland and became subjects of the Czar, and in Lithuanian Poland serfdom was more oppressive than in Russia.

In 1815, the Emperor Alexander, who was considered a Republican monarch, granted the Poles a more liberal constitution than even England expected or desired; and it worked extremely well for fifteen years, during which period Poland made far greater progress than in any former period of her eventful history.

The Poles have trumped up a story, without any adequate proof, that the Emperor Nicholas intended to deprive them of their constitution; but as he ascended the throne on December 24th, 1825, and faithfully performed his constitutional duties as sovereign of Poland until after the unjustifiable revolution of 1830, this charge falls to the ground. In fact, why should the Czar, who respected the free constitution of Finland and Courland till the day of his death, have broken faith with the Poles alone?

In 1846, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, finding that Cracow was a nest of conspirators plotting against the peace and security of their three countries, took possession of the republic, and it was annexed, not to Russia, which is always accused of being so supereminently greedy, but to Austria, for whom England has never any expressions but those of the most extravagant compliment.

Though England protested against the conduct of the three Powers to Cracow, Lord Palmerston, the bitter enemy of Russia in later life, approved of it, as may be seen by Lord Dalling's life of that statesman (p. 248: "Cracow"):—"There is something to be said for the three Courts, but then they have spoiled their own case by not choosing to own that they were afraid of disturbances at home." The grounds put forward in their notes to the Cracow Senate are utterly untenable; however, Lord Dalling adds: "It was considered that Russia and Austria had a right to interfere with Cracow if the persons who resided there menaced the tranquillity of their dominions; and no doubt this was the case. But the two Governments would not acknowledge that they could be menaced, and this Lord Palmerston thought spoilt their case."

An additional illustration of the truculent character of the Poles, and of the fact that other nations have treated them with undue severity as well as Russia, is supplied by the circumstance

that in February, 1846, the peasantry of Gallicia, in Austrian Poland, were incited to insurrection by the nobles and clergy. The Austrians, to prevent this, excited in the peasantry a suspicion of the motives of the nobles, and offered a reward for every noble delivered up, *alive or dead*. A general massacre of the nobility in the circle of Tarnow followed, and the sanguinary peasantry, who are supposed to be such devout Catholics, completed their abominable atrocities by gratuitously murdering the Roman Catholic clergy also. If we really felt so strongly for the wrongs of Poland as we and the French pretend, why did we not on the occasion of the Crimean War fight for the independence, or at least the autonomy, of Russian Poland, and demand as a *sine quâ non* of peace that Poland should have institutions as liberal as those of another portion of the Russian empire, namely, Finland? And if the Poles had possessed ordinary good sense they would have revolted in 1854, when Russia was engaged in the Crimean War, instead of waiting till years after the peace of Paris, when the undivided strength of Russia could be used against them.

The Polish legion which served under Napoleon obtained an infamous notoriety for its surpassing cruelties, and one might almost have supposed that the legion of devils whom Christ cast out, and which entered into the herd of swine, had taken subsequent possession of these Poles.

As to the French, who are so full of verbal and lachrymose sentimentality at the wrongs of Poland, they did not restore their kingdom when Napoleon wintered in their country on the occasion of his Russian campaign; and he remorselessly and ungratefully left them, at the peace, in the power of Russia.

In 1862, the Emperor Alexander II. promised reform and the re-establishment of Poland as a separate kingdom; but, in consequence of the incurable turbulence of the Polish nobles, who were afraid of the emancipation of their miserable serfs and of the inhabitants of some of the towns, the revolution broke out in that year. In 1863, the Poles invaded Volhynia, and tried to raise an insurrection, but they were wholly unsuccessful.

On the occasion of this rebellion, Prince Gortschakoff, the governor, at first acted with great forbearance; and though General Gerstenzweig, the military governor, was assassinated, no very severe measures were adopted; and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Warsaw, Felinski, exhorted the Poles to submission.

In May, 1862, the Grand Duke Constantine was appointed governor, and begun with a lenient policy, but his life was attempted by Jaroszynski; and Telkner, the chief of the police, as well as many other Russians, were murdered, some of whom were poisoned.

Upon this, deplorable measures of excessive rigour were adopted to quell the rebellion and restore order; but none of them were so bad as the conduct of the French under General Pelissier, so recently as the reign of Louis Philippe, who suffocated a large number of men, women, and children in a cave in Algeria; but then ill-treatment of Roman Catholics by Greek heretics is a much more heinous sin than infinitely worse treatment of mere Arabs by orthodox Catholics.

After all, the severity of Russia was nothing in comparison with the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria and elsewhere; and about the worst thing which was alleged against Russia, namely, its treatment of the Polish ladies, was precisely the same as that of General Butler to the ladies of New Orleans during the War of Secession in America. As to the innumerable Polish nobles, Madame de Motteville said of their ostentatious appearance, "Many diamonds and little linen."

As every one knows, the begging for Polish exiles was a continual nuisance for a long succession of years, and a large proportion of these exiles either possessed or fabricated the titles of count or baron, which they could only have obtained from the Russian, Austrian, or Prussian Governments, since there were no titles whatever in Poland; now it seems rather contemptible for men to complain of tyranny, and to retain the titles given them by the alleged tyrants; and Sobieski, King of Poland, spoke bitterly of "the insane ambition of a plebeian noblesse." It should be observed, too, that torture was not abolished in Poland till 1770

We have imperative duties to the Christians of Turkey, because by an aggressive war we deprived them of the protection of Russia, and because we can force the Turks to do them justice by our fleet alone; but we have no duties to the Poles, who have never even been our allies, but were some of our most determined enemies when we fought with the French; and, besides, it is neither the right nor the duty of England to make military promenades across the territories of friendly nations, and it would be impossible for us to land an army in Russia and march it into Poland.

My firm belief is that the true policy of the Poles as a Sclavonian race in these days, when the principle of nationality is the only link which can effectually and permanently bind men together, is to throw in their lot frankly and cordially with Russia, in which case the Czar would most certainly perform the promise he made in 1861, and which he was prevented from fulfilling by their unwise revolution, of restoring to them a liberal constitution. The Russian Emperor has been the very best friend whom the overwhelming majority of the Polish nation have ever had, since he has transformed them from slaves to freemen; and the difference in religion should be no bar to a complete union between two kindred nations, each of whom has something to forgive the other, since nowadays Protestants live happily in Belgium and elsewhere under a Catholic sovereign, and the Pope has recently declared that nowhere in the world have Roman Catholics such freedom in the exercise of their religion as in England, where the Protestants are in an overwhelming and permanent majority.

The Russians have been severely blamed for abolishing the Polish Constitution after the rebellion, but it seems to be forgotten that, on the occasion of an infinitely less serious rebellion in Jamaica, England adopted precisely the same course, and abolished the Constitution of Jamaica.

Alison says:—"The cessation of the jealousy and hostility which had so long subsisted between Russia and Poland, and the opening of the vast market of Muscovy to Polish industry, was an immense advantage. Warsaw, which in 1797 had only 66,572 inhabitants,

rose to 140,000 in 1842. The revenue augmented before 1830 threefold; and the entire kingdom, which in 1815 had only a hundred weaving looms, had, in 1830, 6,000 looms; whilst the scholars, who were only a few hundreds in 1815, rose to 35,000 in 1830."

To show, in conclusion, that the Poles are not so anti-Russian as some pretend, the *Times* says of the present Diet of Gallicia: "The leaders of the Polish nobility, rich proprietors, who possess vast domains in Russia, carefully avoid all that could be construed as a provocation by the Russian Government, and in regard to this the governor, Count Potocki, has even gone the length of disapproving the singing of Polish national airs."

IRELAND THE ENGLISH POLAND.

THE exclusion of the great body of the natives from the benefit of the English law continued for several centuries, from the reign of Henry II. till that of Elizabeth, and its effect was "to deprive the whole Irish nation (excepting the five tribes already mentioned, the descendants of the colonists, and the inhabitants of the seaports) of all remedy at law for any injury done them, and even of all power of suing for redress in any court of justice."

King John landed at Waterford in 1185. "He commenced by offering personal insults to the Irish chieftains who came to offer their respects to him as the son of their sovereign (Henry II.). He and his courtiers plucked their beards, ridiculed their dress and manners, mimicked their attitudes, and finally turned them out of the presence."

The Statute of Kilkenny, passed in 1367, "forbade, under pain of high treason, marriage, fosterage, or gossipred between persons of English descent and the old Irish families. It also forbade all persons of English descent to use the Irish language or to adopt Irish names. . . . It strictly forbade the King's subjects in Ireland to entertain in their houses Irish minstrels, musicians, or story tellers. It also forbade them to allow an Irish horse to graze upon their lands."

Richard II. stipulated that MacMurrough, Prince of Leinster, should quit Leinster by a certain day, having surrendered all the territories there to His Majesty, his heirs and successors. "His Majesty gave full licence and encouragement to MacMurrough to seize upon all such territories belonging to the Irish septs in any other part of the realm which he could grasp by violence. He also undertook to pay MacMurrough a pension of eighty marks."

In the reign of Henry V. a statute was passed in England "forbidding all Irish adventurers whatsoever to come into England, at the same time ordering all who had already come to depart without delay. . . . It also included the sons of the Irish nobility, who were then studying in the English Inns of Court and in the Universities."

"In the year 1463 a Parliament, held at Trim by Fitz-Eustace, Lord Portchester made a law "that anybody may kill thieves or robbers, *or any person going to steal or rob*, having no faithful men of good name and in the English dress in their company."

After the battle of Knockton, Lord Gormanstown said to Kildare, "We have beaten our enemies, but in order to finish the good work we ought now to cut the throats of the Irish who have helped us to do so."

Lord Grey, the English commander, "invited five uncles of Lord Thomas (Fitzgerald) to a feast, in the midst of which he treacherously seized them, and sent them in custody to England." . . . . Henry VIII. "had them all hanged at Tyburn."

The Government (time of Henry VIII.) "transferred the tithes to the Protestant clergy, and the greater portion of abbey lands to powerful laymen, thus throwing on the Catholic people of Ireland the support of two Churches, their own and the new one."

The Lord Lieutenant, Sir William Fitz-William (reign of Elizabeth), "marched into Monaghan, seized on the chief of the McMahons, had him tried and convicted on a false charge of high treason by a jury of common soldiers, by whom the hapless chief was murdered on the spot."

By means of anonymous and false charges, and convictions by packed juries, James I. "confiscated in Ulster 385,000 acres." . . . . Afterwards he issued "a Commission for the discovery of defective titles." Sir William Parsons's (the head of this Commission) mode of proceeding was torture and subornation of perjury. In the celebrated case of the O'Byrnes of the Ranelaghs, "he suborned witnesses to swear an accusation against these gentlemen. . . . He had one witness, named Archer, placed on a gridiron over a charcoal fire, burned in several parts of his body

with hot irons, and barbarously flogged, in order to compel the wretched man to swear against the two O'Byrnes. . . . When he was tortured beyond his endurance he promised to swear all that Parsons wished, and by this diabolical proceeding the proprietors were robbed of their inheritance."

In 1628 the Catholic, and some of the Protestant, nobility of Ireland framed a petition to the King, Charles I., requesting the concession of "certain privileges called the graces" . . . which were "security of property, religious liberty, *free trade*, mitigation of the severities practised by the Established clergy (Protestant), abolition of the private prisons kept by that clergy for the incarceration of persons condemned in the Church courts, a free pardon for all past political offences." . . . For these they offered him the sum—an enormous one for those days—of £100,000." . . . Charles took the money, but did not grant the graces!

By means of the Commission to inquire into defective titles the proprietors were (by Strafford) put upon their trial to show title. The judges were bribed by four shillings in the pound on the first year's rent of the estates, to be paid them in the event of a verdict being found for the King. The jurors were also bribed, and the people were overawed during the trials by the presence of a strong military force. . . . In one or two instances the jurors stood but against both terror and corruption, for which they were fined, pilloried, their ears cut off and their tongues bored through, and their foreheads marked with hot irons" (*vide* "Journals of the Irish House of Commons," vol i. p. 307). . . . "The proprietors were afforded the alternative of redeeming their estates by the payment of a fine to the Crown for new titles. . . . Strafford in this manner extorted £17,000 from the O'Byrnes, and £70,000 from the London Companies to whom James I. had granted lands in Ulster. . . . It has been asserted that there was a great massacre of the Protestants committed by the Irish Catholics in 1641. No proof whatever or mention is made of this in the Government documents or proclamations of the period. Milton

says 600,000 were massacred; Burton and Temple say 300,000; Frankland, May, and Baker say 200,000; Rapin says 154,000; Warwick says 100,000; Clarendon says 40,000 or 50,000; David Hume says 40,000; Dr. Warner says 4,028." According to Sir William Petty, the best statist of his day, the entire number of Irish Protestants then only amounted to about 220,000. (So that the Catholics killed, according to Milton, three times the whole population.) Dr. Leland says (Book v. chap. 4), "The favourite object of the Irish governors and the English Parliament was the utter extermination of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland." Carter says ("Life of Ormonde," i. 330), "The Lords Justices (!) had set their hearts on the extirpation, not only of the mere Irish, but likewise of all the old English families that were Roman Catholics." Lord Clarendon (i. 215) says that the Parliamentary party "had sworn to extirpate the whole Irish nation!" On the 10th October, 1648, Charles I. had written to Ormonde, "Be not startled at my great concessions concerning Ireland, for they will come to nothing." Charles II. began by confirming the peace which Ormonde had signed with the confederate Catholics; but having landed in Scotland in 1650, he declared "that it was null and void; that he did detest and abhor Popery, superstition and idolatry, *together with prelacy*, resolving not to tolerate, much less to allow those in any part of his dominions, and to endeavour the extirpation thereof to the utmost of his power." Cromwell, on taking possession of Drogheda, though he had promised quarter, "massacred the inhabitants in cold blood." For three days the slaughter continued, and Cromwell, in his despatch to Parliament, thanked God for *that great mercy*, as he called it. . . . At Wexford he massacred 300 women who had assembled at the Cross. . . . The ancient possessions of the men who had fought for the King were given over to the hosts of Cromwellian adventurers, and all the loyal Irish who survived the late war, and who could be collected, were driven into the province of Connaught, and forbidden to recross the Shannon under pain of death.

Charles II., at his restoration, "confirmed the Cromwellian party in the estates they had seized from his loyal suffering Irish Catholic subjects." "The English zealots dragged him (Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh) to London, to answer for his alleged participation in a rebellious conspiracy. He offered to bring witnesses from Ireland to establish his innocence, but was refused the time necessary for that purpose. He was of course found guilty and hanged, though not a tittle of credible evidence was produced against him. . . ."

The Irish army at the time of the Treaty of Limerick was 15,000 strong. Of these about 12,500 resolved to depart from Ireland and enter the service of France. They formed the commencement of the Irish Brigade in France.

The English Parliament in 1698 presented an address to William III., praying him to discourage the woollen manufacture of Ireland. William's answer was: "I shall do all that in me lies to discourage the woollen manufacture of Ireland, and to encourage the linen manufacture therein." He did the first and not the second.

In the reign of Queen Anne an Act, generally known as the Penal Code, was passed against the Irish. "The Catholics were thereby rendered incapable of acquiring landed property in fee or by lease, or for any term longer than thirty-one years; and even for that limited time they were not permitted to possess an interest in their land greater than one-third the amount of the rent, on pain of forfeiting the entire to the good Protestant who should discover the extent of such interest. . . . If the child of a Papist possessing an estate should conform to Protestantism, the parent was debarred from disposing of his property by sale, mortgage, or will, and the Court of Chancery was empowered to order an annuity out of the estate for the use of such conforming child. . . . Catholics were declared incapable of inheriting the estates of their Protestant relations. The estate of aCatholic who had not a Protestant heir was to be divided in gavel among all his children. All men were to be qualified for office, or for voting at elections, by taking the oath of abjuration, and by

receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as administered in the Established Protestant Church. A Catholic possessing a horse, no matter of what value, was compelled to surrender the horse to any Protestant on payment of £5. . . . A grant of £40 per annum was made to every Popish priest who should embrace the Established religion."

In 6th George I., the English Parliament enacted a law declaring itself possessed of full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the people of the kingdom of Ireland. The English Parliament also deprived the Irish House of Lords of its final jurisdiction in cases of appeal. . . . By the Irish Parliament a Bill was actually passed by both Houses which decreed a personal penalty on every Catholic ecclesiastic of so revoltingly indecent a nature, that it cannot be explicitly mentioned. . . . This bill did not pass, being defeated in the English Privy Council.

In 1747 the Protestant Primate, Dr. Stone, "converted his house into a brothel to win the support of the younger members of Parliament to his measures, by pandering to their vices.

The Irish Commons in 1785, had granted the Minister new taxes to the amount of £140,000, on the faith of his conceding to Ireland certain commercial advantages known as the eleven propositions. "The Minister took the taxes, but instead of conceding the eleven propositions, he introduced a code of twenty propositions injurious to Irish commerce, which had been suggested by the leading English merchants. This code encountered a powerful, but at first fruitless resistance in the Irish House of Commons, and the measure was ultimately withdrawn an event which the people signalized by an illumination."

In 1795-6 "A persecution, accompanied with all the circumstances of ferocious cruelty, then raged in the country. Neither age nor sex, nor even acknowledged innocence, could excite mercy. The only crime with which the wretched objects were charged was the profession of the Roman Catholic faith. A lawless banditti constituted themselves judges of this new delinquency, and the sentence they pronounced was equally concise and terrible. It

was nothing less than confiscation of property and immediate banishment" (Lord Gosford's address to the Magistracy of Armagh, *Dublin Journal*, 5th January, 1796). Lord Gosford added, "These horrors are now acting with impunity."

Lord Moira, in his speech in the British House of Lords, 22nd November, 1797, says :—

"I have known a man, in order to extort confession of a supposed crime, or of that of some neighbour, picketed till he actually fainted ; picketed a second time till he fainted again ; and when he came to himself, a third time picketed till he once more fainted, and all this on mere suspicion." "Men had been taken and hung up till they were half dead, and afterwards threatened with a repetition of this treatment unless they made a confession of their imputed guilt. . . . These were not particular acts of cruelty, but part of a system."

The venial rebellions in Scotland in favour of the Stuart dynasty were stamped out by England with the most merciless severity, and Smollett, the poet, novelist, and historian, thus pathetically describes the barbarities committed in the Highlands by order of the butcher Cumberland after the battle ofCulloden, in 1746, in the noble verses which he called "The Tears of Scotland."

THE TEARS OF SCOTLAND.*

By Tobias Smollett (1721—1771).

Mourn, hapless Caledonia! mourn
Thy banished peace, thy laurels torn!
Thy sons, for valour long renowned,
Lie slaughtered on their native ground;
Thy hospitable roofs no more
Invite the stranger to the door.
In smoky ruins sunk they lie
The monuments of cruelty.

* This poem was originally written in six stanzas, but on some one representing to Smollett that such a diatribe against Government would injure his prospects he sat down and added the seventh stanza, which is a still stronger invective.

The wretched owner sees afar
His all become the prey of war,
Bethinks him of his babes and wife,
Then smites his breast and curses life!
Thy swains are famished on the rocks
Where once they fed their wanton flocks;
Thy ravished virgins shriek in vain,
Thy infants perish on the plain!

What boots it then, in every clime,
Through the wide-spreading waste of time,
Thy martial glory, drowned with praise,
Still shone with undiminished blaze?
Thy towering spirit now is broke,
Thy neck is bended to the yoke.
What foreign arms could never quell,
By civil rage and rancour fell.

The rural pipe and merry lay
No more shall cheer the happy day;
No social scenes of gay delight
Beguile the dreary winter night.
No strains but those of sorrow flow,
And naught be heard but sounds of woe,
While the pale phantoms of the slain
Glide nightly o'er the silent plain.

Oh, baneful cause! oh, fatal morn!
Accursed to ages yet unborn!
The sons against their father stood,
The parent shed his children's blood.
Yet when the rage of battle ceased
The victor's soul was not appeased:
The naked and forlorn must feel
Devouring flames and murdering steel!

The pious mother, doomed to death,
Forsaken, wanders o'er the heath;
The bleak wind whistles round her head,
Her helpless orphans cry for bread.
Bereft of shelter, food, and friend,
She views the shades of night descend,
And, stretched beneath the inclement skies,
Weeps o'er her tender babes and dies.

While the warm blood bedews my veins,
And unimpaired remembrance reigns,
Resentment of my country's fate
Within my filial breast shall beat.
And, spite of her insulting foe,
My sympathising verse shall flow.
Mourn, hapless Caledonia, mourn
Thy banished peace, thy laurels torn!

A BENEVOLENT DESPOTISM BETTER THAN OPPRESSIVE PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

MR. FREEMAN, in his valuable work on the Ottoman Government, writes as follows :—

"A king who rules despotically over several nations will often rule them better than if he ruled with a common Parliament for all of them; for a well-disposed despot may deal equal justice to all the nations under his rule, and may not rule in the interest of any one nation in particular. But in a common Parliament of two or more nations which have a mutual dislike, that nation which has the greatest numbers will outvote the others, and all legislation will be done in the interest of the dominant nation only. To take one instance only. The Germans who were under the rule of the Danish kings, complained much less while the Danish kings ruled despotically, than they did after Denmark had a free Constitution. And now that things are turned about, now that some Danes are under German rule, they have still less chance of being heard than the Germans had who were under Danish rule."

After the Revolution, the course of taking the law into their own hands (and being thus prosecutors, judge, and jury), appears to have been resorted to by the House of Commons; and the journals from that period to the year 1768 are full of cases, to the number of several hundreds, in which the House of Commons, who cannot examine witnesses on oath, entertained complaints of breach of privilege by members in respect of matters

having no sort of connection with their public character. The following are a few of the instances in which such complaints were referred to a Committee of Privileges—bringing actions against them, proceeding in Chancery against them, delivering declarations in ejectment, driving away their cattle, digging their coals, cutting their woods, breaking down their fences, ploughing up their lands, killing their rabbits, fishing in their ponds, breaking open their gates and driving over their fields, distraining upon their lands, taking goods which they had previously distrained, erecting buildings on their wastes, distraining upon their tenants and arresting or suing their servants. Some of the instances of privilege are sufficiently ludicrous. Picking a member's pocket and delivering an exorbitant bill of costs were held breaches of privilege; whilst on the other hand Dr. Steward's servant, who had unluckily been "committed to prison for getting a woman with child," claimed and was allowed his privilege. In the greater number of these cases questions of private right were in controversy which ought to have been tried at law, and with which privilege had nothing whatever to do. Yet under this colour they were brought under the jurisdiction of the House, and the parties complained of were frequently ordered into custody *without being even heard in their defence.* The consequences may be easily imagined. In general, the unfortunate individuals abandoned their claims, and made satisfaction to the members; in others, where they were more obstinate, they were chiefly committed to prison.

One of these cases is thus stated by Lord Brougham in Mr. Long Wellesley's case, Russ. and My, 659: "In the year 1759 an action of trespass for breaking and entering a fishery was tried in the House of Commons, to the lasting opprobrium of Parliamentary privilege, to the scandal and disgrace of the House of Parliament that tried it, and to the astonishment and alarm of all good men, whether lawyers or laymen. Admiral Griffin made complaint to the House, whereof he was a member, that three men, whose names were stated, had broken into and entered his fishery at Plymouth, had taken the fish therefrom, and destroyed

the nets therein; and the House forthwith, instead of indignantly and in mockery of such a pretension, dismissing the charge, and censuring him who made it, ordered the defendants in the trespass, for so they must be called, to be committed into the custody of the Sergeant-at-arms. They were committed into that custody accordingly. They were brought to the bar of the House of Commons, and there on their knees they confessed their fault. They promised never again to offend the admiral by interfering with his *alleged* right of fishery, and upon this confession and promise they were discharged on paying their fees. So that, by way of privilege, a trespass was actually tried by the plaintiff himself, sitting in judgment against his adversary the defendant, and the judge (for in this case the House and the complaining party must be considered as identical) was pleased to decide in his own favour."

From the manner in which the case is stated by Lord Brougham, it might be supposed that he considered it as a solitary instance in times so recent of so gross an abuse of privilege. But this is not so. There are several subsequent cases, and one so lately as 1768, of a precisely similar character (Commons' Journals, vol. xxxi. p. 540).

In 1667 the right of fishing at Coton, on the River Thame, was in dispute between Mr. Luttrell, a member of the House, and a gentleman of the name of Adderley. On the 1st December, 1767, Mr. Luttrell complained to the House "that in breach of the privilege of this House, Henry Fidler, John Baker, and Matthew Barrow had, by the instigation of Charles Bowyer Adderley, Esq., forcibly entered upon his fishery and taken fish thereout." The matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges. The committee heard witnesses to prove the title of Mr. Luttrell and the fact of trespass on the one hand, and to prove the title of Mr. Adderley on the other. The witnesses, of course, were not examined upon oath (the House not having power to administer an oath); the evidence received was, as may be imagined, for the most part inadmissible at law; and upon the whole matter the committee came to the following resolution (which was adopted

by the House) :—"Resolved, that it is the opinion of this committee that Henry Fidler hath not, by the instigation of Charles Adderley, Esq., forcibly entered upon a fishery at Coton, on the River Thame, the property of and in possession of Simon Luttrell, Esq., a member of this House, and taken fish thereout in breach of the privilege of this House." Similar resolutions were passed with respect to Baker and Barrow.

Whether the committee meant to decide that no forcible entry had been made, or that it had not been done by the instigation of Adderley, or that the fishery was not the property of Mr. Luttrell, or that he was not in possession of it, or that the trespass was not a breach of the privilege of the House, it is difficult, and, indeed, not very important, to understand.

"In 1641 it was ordered by the Commons that no member shall either give a copy, or publish or print anything relating to the proceedings of the House; and that all members of the House are enjoined to deliver out no copy or notes of anything that is brought into the House, or propounded or agitated in the House; and that it is a breach of the privilege of this House for any person whatsoever to print or publish in print anything relating to the proceedings of the House, without the leave of the House. Formerly persons brought to the bar of either House of Parliament had to kneel, but the practice is now discontinued since the refusal of Mr. Murray to kneel when brought up at the bar of the House of Commons in 1750. For this refusal he was declared guilty of 'a high and *most dangerous contempt* of the authority and privilege of this House,' and was committed close prisoner to Newgate, and was not allowed the use of pen, ink, and paper."

I conclude this chapter by quoting Macaulay's opinion of the House of Commons, which shows that he, though a most successful debater as well as a brilliant writer, had a very contemptuous opinion of its judgment as regards oratory :—

"A place in which I would not promise success to any man. I have great doubts even about Jeffrey. It is the most peculiar audience in the world. I should say that a man's being a good

writer, a good orator at the bar, a good mob orator, or a good orator in debating clubs, was rather a reason for expecting him to fail than for expecting him to succeed in the House of Commons. A place where Walpole succeeded and Addison failed, where Dundas succeeded and Burke failed, where Peel now succeeds and where Mackintosh fails, where Erskine and Scarlett were dinner bells, where Laurence and Jekyll, the two wittiest men, or nearly so, of their time, were thought bores, is surely a very strange place."

Mr. Parnell had the audacity to say of the House of Commons:—"We have only been at work two months, and they, the English members, would be glad to be rid of us. But I don't know what state of mind they will be in when the end of the session comes. Nor can they devise a plan to stop us. If we had only ten men we could put a stop to all their work. If we can't meet them in the field with cold steel, we have yet a weapon left to us. Ireland knows that it would be futile to resort to arms for the restitution of her rights, and that the lives of her sons would be thrown away. But we must use the weapon we have until England learns sense, by inflicting inconvenience upon her, by paying her back measure for measure, returning insult for insult, and thus have vengeance upon her.

"If he were to tell them that the Speaker was a man of great ability, but that he looked upon Home Rule members much as a trapper would look upon vermin, he would, in all probability, incur his displeasure and the consequences of that displeasure. There was an innate feeling of snobbery among the English constituencies which compelled the members to become snobs themselves, and to bow to the House. Mr. Biggar and himself had shown them that it was not necessary to take their tone from the House."

Mr. Egerton, in "Sybil," says in 1839, as to speeches in the House—"Fishy is down, Boshy is up."

The House of Commons is about the clumsiest and most ill-contrived machine for the transaction of business which could possibly be imagined. It sits usually from four in the afternoon

till an indefinite hour in the morning, fifty embryo Acts of Parliament being sometimes on the paper for discussion on a single day, and it is absolutely impossible that the affairs of the nation can be efficiently discussed and settled after dinner in the dog days, when the majority of members, wearied out with the fatigues of the day, are half asleep. The House of Lords does not condemn itself to any such late hours, and neither the courts of law, vestry, parochial, county, or other meetings take place in the middle of the night; but, if this post prandial system is a good one, all other business meetings should be made equally nocturnal, and the dull lees of the human intellect must be esteemed better than its sparkling wine; but, perhaps, with our English dislike of logic, we have invented this system, which is not followed by any other country, or even by our own colonies, in order to avoid the insupportable evil of being consistent and like other nations who are idiotic enough to be logical. This owlish system of legislation injures the health and shortens the lives of most members, but, like the Medes and Persians, English legislators, afraid of their own shadow, have always been apt to answer as the Barons did, when it was proposed to establish the just and humane Scotch law of legitimacy for the Draconian and wicked English system which still exists of visiting on children the frailties of their parents, and preventing the latter, however willing, from doing them justice, "*Nolumus mutari legum Anglicæ.*'

Every session, at the massacre of the innocents, we sacrifice that large and sometimes greater portion of the session which has been spent in introducing and advancing measures up to, it may be, the third and last reading, instead of, as common sense (which is the most uncommon commodity in the world) would prescribe, resuming measures in the next session at the point at which they were left in the preceding session.

Another illustration of the folly and imbecility of Parliament is that it allowed a minority of only five members, whose sole object was killing time by useless and mischievous adjournments on a recent occasion to trot the other members round the treadmill of the division lobbies till about six the following afternoon in

eighteen successive divisions; but on a former occasion victory remained with the five, who compelled the House to beat an ignominious retreat; just as you may see a little dog chasing a whole flock of sheep, any one of which, if it had only the necessary courage and sense, could cut short its existence in a single moment; and tolerating from them, with a patience they seldom display to modest members, interminable speeches like bags of wind with nothing in them, which might be stopped by limiting the duration of speeches, as in the French and other assemblies, and the compulsory closing of the debate, which no minority complains of in any other country.

Again, when a Scotch Bill, for instance, is under discussion, you will hardly see a single English or Irish member present in the House, as they do not understand Scotch laws and customs, yet all the other business of the country is suspended during the progress of Scotch business, which might be avoided by the simple expedient (recommended by the highest living authority on this subject) of Grand Committees which could elaborate Scotch and Irish legislation, like existing Committees on Private Bills, and then the Bills could come before the full House on the report or third reading, after the garrulous members had talked themselves hoarse. It would almost seem as if we might do well to take a lesson from even the Ottoman Parliament as to the best means of conducting business, or we could teach them the secret of doing the minimum of work with the maximum of fatigue and the greatest possible expenditure of time. I may add that the English system of starving juries into a spurious unanimity and of restricting their verdict, even in trials for murder, to guilty or not guilty, is a reproach to the age; for in Scotland, juries decide by a majority, as common sense prescribes; and when the evidence of guilt is, as in the trial of Madeleine Smith (which I attended), very strong but insufficient to justify conviction, their verdict *by a majority* was "not proven," thus branding her with a well-merited stigma, rather than hang a possibly innocent, but probably guilty person.

As a sample of the intelligence and political ability of the

country party, as they call themselves, I subjoin the following extract from the *World* :—

"Should a member of any one of those foreign nationalities, which are so often and so fervently admonished to take a lesson in the art of constitutional government from this country, happen to have made a personal study of the House of Commons towards the close of last Session, or of the progress of the contested election recently held in North Northamptonshire, he may be pardoned if he has failed to discern the peculiar excellences of the British representative system. Lord Burghley naïvely said to the electors, 'You know all about who I am; you have read my address; you know what my principles are, and whether you agree with them or whether you don't, don't much matter.' This is perfectly true; and with this frank statement of facts, his lordship's constituents ought to have been content. The sequel shows either that Lord Burghley, in a spirit of military gallantry, volunteered to undertake a task for which he was not equal, or that his agents were culpably negligent in repressing inconvenient inquiries. One elector wanted to know what his future representative thought about County Boards. Lord Burghley, with great acumen, detected what is commonly called a 'sell' in the inquiry. 'You are trying,' he said, 'to catch me. You tell me your opinion, and I will then tell you mine.' The answer came at last. His lordship perceived that he was not the victim of any hoaxing or disingenuous conundrum, and with much readiness said, 'Why, with reference to County Boards—I have not read of them before.' The following elegant extract from a report of the *Wellingborough News* will convey the best notion of the lively and edifying scene :

"'Mr. Thomas Watts wished to know why a man living in a town was more entitled to vote than a man living in the country. (Hear, hear.)

"'Lord Burghley : I suppose if you live in a borough, as I apprehend you do, you are a better man than if you lived in the country.

"'Mr. Watts : I want your opinion, not mine.

"'Lord Burghley: My opinion is much the same—(laughter)—knowing little of politics as I do. (Laughter.) I suppose you wish to hear a little more, although my lungs are cracking. I really can't last out much longer. I have got two ears, but only one mouth. (Roars of laughter.)

"'Mr. Watts: Were you afraid the army was going out to the East, and was that the reason you left it?

"'Lord Burghley: "Sir, I am an Englishman; you are an Englishman; and I am almost ashamed, and I think it rather an insult for one Englishman to say to another Englishman, in so many words, that he ran away. (Loud cheers.)

"'Mr. Thos. Watts (excitedly): I have read in the history of my country of ears being slit and of noses being cut off. Who did it?

"'Lord Burghley: Well now, gentlemen, I can't talk to you much longer, because I shall bu'st if I do. (Loud laughter.)'

"Not the slightest political significance can be attached to the immense majority by which Lord Burghley defeated Captain Wyatt-Edgell. The Liberal candidate was indeed ostensibly supported by the great Whig families who are influential in Northamptonshire. As a matter of fact this support was thoroughly insincere and practically worthless. Captain Edgell, to judge from his speeches and his conduct throughout the election, is a sensible sort of person, and he ought to have known from the first that he was not the man to whom the Whigs would give their personal service or influence. He is not connected with any one of the great Whig houses; he is not within the charmed circles; he has not even gone through the show of initiation into the exclusive mysteries. Had a Spencer, a Cavendish, or a Gordon been forthcoming, it is likely enough that the election would have had a different result. But if Captain Wyatt-Edgell really expected that his Whig friends would give him the slightest assistance as against Lord Burghley, he can know very little either of English politics in general or of local politics in particular."

REFUTATION OF COLONEL MANSFIELD.

COLONEL MANSFIELD'S report, instead of being original and the result of enquiries made by him on the spot, is merely a reproduction of the correspondence in the foreign Polish gazettes, such as the *Gazette Narodowa* and the *Dziennik Polski* of Lemberg. It, therefore, is a document of no sort of authority or value.

Colonel Mansfield reports, on 21st September, 1871, that an Imperial ordinance had been issued, in virtue of which the heterodox Churches in Poland had been placed under the authority of the Holy Synod, and he adds that its evident object was the forced entrance of the United Greeks into the fold of the orthodox Church. The fact is, however, not only that no such ordinance exists, but that the authority of the Holy Synod cannot possibly extend beyond its own fold, and that never at any time has any one of the heterodox Churches been even temporarily placed under its superintendence; and why, one wonders, did not Colonel Mansfield forward a copy of this supposed ordinance, if a forged one has been palmed on his credulity? After the insurrection of 1863-4, the administration of the United Greek diocese of Chelm, recognising the danger which menaced the United Greek Church, and with it Russian or Ruthenian nationality from the Latin Church and Polonism, took in hand to purify the United Greek rite from all foreign admixture, and amongst other things the use of organs in churches, and on the 2nd October, 1873, the Consistory of the United Greeks of Chelm ordered by circular that from the 1st January, 1874, the Oriental rite should be strictly observed in all the churches of the diocese, without, however,

separating from the Catholic Church. This ordinance had so much the more authority since it was based on the very act of the Union several times confirmed by the Popes in the course of cen turies, and it was accepted by nearly all those interested.

However, in several places, such as Horodyszeze and other parishes of the Government of Seidlce, the peasants seized the keys of the church, or penetrating with violence into the churches during the celebration of divine service, began vociferating and insulting the priests, to force them to officiate according to the half Latinised rite. The local administration being unable to quell these tumults, a military force had to be employed, and after several soldiers and officers had been wounded by stones from the mob, and barricades had been constructed to prevent entrance into a church, the soldiers had to fire in self-defence, and in all ten men were killed and fourteen wounded in the whole of the united Greek insurrection, whilst no one was flogged, as was asserted.

In February, 1874, order was re-established everywhere but in a few isolated parishes, where the peasants did not attend the churches or seek the services of the priests for their religious wants; but, on some of the ringleaders being arrested, and on fines never exceeding £60 being imposed on some of the Communes, these disturbances ceased.

On May 23rd, 1874, a Papal Bull was issued by Pius IX. in opposition to the decisions of his predecessors, blaming the beforementioned circular of the diocesan administration of Cholm, and exhorting the Uniats not to submit to it. The agitation on the publication of this Bull was received and spread over thirty-three parishes of Seidlce. The peasants directed their hostility principally against the priests, who had strictly obeyed the circular; and in many places, not content with forcing from them the keys of the churches, they drove them and their families from their houses. The military had then again to be sent for, and were quartered in the disturbed parishes until tranquillity was re-established, but no physical force was used.

A curious circumstance is that the Circular of October 2, 1873,

was received without any opposition by the United Greek population of Lublin, where it is more numerous, and only met with a twice repeated resistance from the Uniats of Siedlce. The Papal Bull, too, failed in its effect at Lublin, the reason being that at Lublin the Uniats are established in large and compact masses, while in Siedlce they are isolated from each other by numerous Roman Catholic communes, contrary to what Colonel Mansfield asserts.

Fatigued at last by the pressure undergone from their Roman Catholic neighbours, and wishing to get rid for the future of these lamentable results, several United Greek communes—in the first place six—spontaneously formed the idea to re-enter the circle of the orthodox Church. This initiative produced a great effect, and the example was speedily followed by forty-five parishes in Siedlce, who addressed a petition to the Governor demanding authority to pass over to orthodoxy.

The Government decided to proceed with the utmost circumspection, and only to accede to the demands which were the free expression of a general desire of those interested, and it demanded that the petitions in question should be accompanied by communal decisions with reference to this matter, besides which individuals were sent to investigate on the spot if these acts were really spontaneous.

After these precautions had been satisfactorily adopted, forty-five parishes were admitted into the orthodox Church on the 12th of January, 1875, and on forty-four other parishes petitioning for the same favour, seven of them were refused because the demand had not been general and spontaneous.

In April and May this example was followed by the United Greeks of Souwalki and Lublin, and in the same way, after the disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843, large numbers of Presbyterians, tired of the squabbles between the Free Church and the Establishment, sought and obtained admission into the fold of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.

I have to remark, in conclusion, on this subject is, that it can hardly be a matter of importance to Russia, which contains 60,120,996 orthodox Greeks, to force even the whole 246,485

United Greeks in Poland into the orthodox fold, still less the minority, which has, after all this fuss, actually joined it; and one does not understand, if these eighty-two congregations of United Greeks were forced to return to the orthodox fold, why the greater number who still remain outside it are not equally compelled to enter, and why, too, they do not attempt to compel the four-and-a-half millions of Polish Catholics to rejoin the Greek Church, as the ferocious Catholics of France tried to force the Huguenots into the Romanish faith by persecution, exile, and massacres. Mr. Gladstone informs us that so far from the Russians being prone to proselytise, "Russia has paid to the Mahometan religion a respect so profound that missionary efforts are actually put down, a course we do not adopt, even in India;" and, as I have already stated, they rejected seven parishes which they might have secured because the desire for union was not sufficiently spontaneous and general.

It is quite evident that in proportion as the temporal power of the Pope has become weaker, his spiritual rule has become more exacting, and it is absolutely despotic since the whole temporal power has vanished. Formerly, in cases of mixed marriages of Protestants and Catholics, the boys were brought up in the religion of the father, and the girls in that of the mother; now the Pope cruelly refuses to permit any Catholic to marry a Protestant, unless the Protestant will promise to educate all the children in the Romish superstition. Then again, the unparalleled absurdity of the doctrine of the infallibilty of the Pope has been forced down the reluctant throats of the Catholics all over the world by the present tyrannical Pope, and in the case of these Uniats he has illegally deprived them of the liberty of their reforming rite secured by the article of the union with the Catholic Church.

Yet so inconsistent and unscrupulous is the Roman Catholic Church, that they allow the priests of the United Greeks to marry and to preserve other distinctive features of their former creed, so that in two adjoining communes in Poland, for instance, there are often two priests who might each have a foot in the territory of the other, and one of these, a United Greek, is allowed by the Pope to marry, whilst, if the Roman Catholic priest, his neighbour

married, he would be driven with ignominy from his Church—excommunicated like Luther—and if he died unrepentant, and without repudiating his wife, he would be adjudged to have gone to the region of eternal punishment; in fact, it seems as if in case Luther had been a United Greek, he might possibly not have instituted the Reformation.

Sydney Smith wittily characterises Popery as posture and imposture, flections and genuflections, bowing to the right, curtseying to the left, and an immense amount of man millinery.

I may add, as the Roman Catholics are so addicted to trumping up false charges against Russia, with reference to its conduct to their co-religionists, and the United Greeks in Poland, that Count Valerian Krasinski, a Protestant Pole, whom I personally knew, says in his "Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland" (published by Murray in 2 vols. in 1838), "The Protestant cause attained in that country (Poland) in the course of half a century such a degree of strength that its final triumph over Romanism seemed to be quite certain. Yet, notwithstanding this advantageous position, it was overthrown, and nearly destroyed in the course of another half century. *This* extraordinary *reaction was not effected by the strong hand of a legally constituted authority*, as was the case in Italy, Spain, and some other countries, *but by a bigoted and unprincipled faction, acting not with the assistance, but in opposition to the laws of the country.* . . The Jesuits,* who defended in that country the interests of Rome, being unable to combat their antagonists with fire and sword, adopted other measures, which inflicted on Poland calamities more severe than those which might have been produced by bloody conflicts between religious parties. . . the odious maxim that no faith should be kept with heretics was continually advocated by them. . . The public schools were for a long time almost exclusively conducted by them. This measure produced its natural consequences; science and literature were almost annihilated; and Poland, which had made rapidstrides in every kind of improvement during the sixteenth century instead of advancing, retro-

* Qui cum Jesu non itis Jesuitis.

graded with equal rapidity. The celebrated Jesuit Skarga, who lived at the end of the sixteenth, and beginning of the seventeenth century, complains that more than 2,000 Romanist Churches were made into Protestant ones, but there are now only 327,815 Protestants in Poland.

The Roman Catholic Church of all others should be the most chary of bandying reproaches, since its cruelties and absurdities are infinitely greater than those of all the other Churches put together; and, within the last few weeks, Cardinal Antonelli, the favourite minister and confidant of Pio Nono, who died in the odour of sanctity, is proved to have been a hypocrite, a thoroughly immoral man, and that he expended no less a sum than £80,000 in bringing up and educating one of his illegitimate children, th Countess Lambertini.

The *Tablet* is evidently totally unable to reply to my facts and arguments on the treatment of the Polish Uniats, for in an article in reply to what I wrote in the *Press* and *St. James's Chronicle* on that subject, in which I had inadvertently and incorrectly stated that Colonel Mansfield was married to a Polish lady, instead of, as is the fact, that she is an Ultramontane pervert, they said that this mistake alone invalidated all that I had said.

I will wind up this chapter by quoting the appalling picture which Sir James Stephen draws of the crimes of the Papacy, which certainly cannot be paralleled in the history of the Patriarchs of the Greek Church, who have been usually men of the highest character :—

"Except in the annals of Eastern despotisms, no parallel can be found for the disasters of the Papacy during the century and a half which followed the extinction of the Carlovingian dynasty. Of the twenty-four Popes who during that period ascended the apostolic throne, two were murdered, five were driven into exile, four were deposed, and three resigned their hazardous dignity. Some of these Vicars of Christ were raised to that awful pre-eminence by arms and some by money. Two received it from the hands of princely courtesans. One was self-appointed. A well-filled purse purchased one papal abdication; the promise of a fair

bride another. One of these holy fathers pillaged the treasury, fled with the spoil, returned to Rome, ejected his substitute, and mutilated him in a manner too revolting for description. In one page of this dismal history we read of the disinterred corpse of a former Pope brought before his successor to receive a retrospective sentence of deposition, and in the next we find the judge himself undergoing the same posthumous condemnation, though without the same filthy ceremonial. Of these heirs of St. Peter, one entered on his infallibility in his eighteenth year, and one before he had seen his twelfth summer. One, again, took to himself a coadjutor that he might command, in person, such legions as Rome then sent into the field. Another, Judas-like, agreed for certain pieces of silver to recognize the Patriarch of Constantinople as universal Bishop. All sacred things had become venal; crime and debauchery held revel in the Vatican, while the afflicted Church, wedded at once to three husbands (such was the language of the times), witnessed the celebration of as many rival masses in the metropolis of Christendom."—*Edinburgh Review*, No. 164.

Here is *Truth's* account of Saint Antonelli :—" Paying the other day a visit, I found two young ladies, with arms round each other's waist, deep in the 'Peerage.' A delicate forefinger of one of the fair creatures ran along the printed lines of the volume, stopping at short intervals. At each pause she said, 'It can't be this one.' I did not wish to eavesdrop; but so charming was the unconsciously formed *tableau vivant*, that it went against me to disturb it. I do not know how long I might have remained listening and admiring, if the girl who was not pointing had not cast her eyes towards a pier-glass. Seeing me reflected there, she turned round and said, with the artless grace of her age, 'How nice of you to drop in just as we're trying to find out what duchess married when Cardinal Antonelli's daughter was a very little baby. Of course, you know all about the scandal. Were you not in Rome in 1855? Can you remember what English girls of very high rank used to ride that year on the Campagna, and which of them was most intimate at the Borghésé palace?' I could have told, but I held my tongue.

"I am not surprised at the Countess Lambertini's claim to the 37,000,000 fr. at which Antonelli's fortune is estimated. What I wonder at is, that there are not a great many other claimants. The Cardinal ever evinced a repugnance for holy orders. To be a deacon, he was obliged to take a vow of celibacy; but he knew himself too well to become a priest, and in all his life never confessed a penitent. Numerous were the young Romans whom he brought up and settled. The daughter of a Portuguese singer was watched by him with paternal fondness from her cradle upwards. A boy now in the Papal Guard often visited him in his rooms in the Vatican, and never left him without a handsome present. The Cardinal bought an estate near Terracina for this youth, who was the son of a Sicilian Abbess. His Eminence was lavish in his generosity to the daughter of a diplomatic Count and Countess from Munich.

"In his will, Antonelli repudiated with virtuous indignation the reports wicked men had spread about the immensity of his fortune and its origin. He derived, he said, the best part of it from his respectable father, who was a farmer at Sonnina. In England this was believed; in Rome it was not.

"The respectable father left eight children, and unless a loaves and fishes miracle was performed at the cutting up of his estate, what fell to each inheritor could not have been a fat portion. There were five sons and three daughters; and Jacopo was the fifth child. An excellent family man was this Prince of the Church. His relations were shrewd, avaricious *contadini*, but close-mouthed and reliable. He was not ashamed of them; and they served him faithfully in transacting financial business.

"Cardinal Antonelli was concerned with the financialists of Louis Napoleon. His brother Angelo, under the pretext of being sent to Paris to *surveiller* Sacconi, the Nuncio, went there to operate with Mirès—the patron, by-the-bye, of Louis Veuillot. Angelo, on the downfall of that financialist, got hold of a Viennese clerk of Rothschild's, a handsome, impudent fellow, gifted with a florid kind of eloquence. He advised him to be converted and to enter orders, and he secretly pushed him on at

the Tuileries, where the Hebrew priest, who was at once raised to red stockings, became a prodigious favourite of the ladies, the confessor of the Empress, and cut out the beau, Nigra.

"Filippe Antonelli, another brother, was also a financialist. He was the Cardinal's man of straw at the Roman Bank, of which he was the manager. Filippe is counted the most miserly man in Rome. He lives in a small house at Santa Agata alla Suburra, and bears the title of Count.

"Gregorio, the eldest brother, is the gentleman of the family. His special function was to look after the Cardinal's children, and to negotiate hush-money payments. His son Agostino was the uncle's favourite, and was obliged by him to marry a daughter of the Countess Garcia. It was stipulated, however, that this marriage was only to be a Platonic partnership. The niece-in-law was given a royal dower, and was bequeathed the Cardinal's silver-gilt breakfast-service, which he prayed her not 'to lock up, but use freely.' Since his death she has gone to live in Paris.

"Signora Marconi, who adopted the girl Loreta, was a fine-looking Roman lady, without an avowable income. She kept a political *salon*, received a mixed company, was well with the Monsignori, went to the Borghésé receptions, and was suspected of taking secret-service money from three great Empires. Since 1870 she has professed herself a Garibaldian."

Pope Pius IX., who has for years ignored King Victor Emanuel, and repulsed his advances, has now, it is said, written an autograph letter urging his Majesty to burk the inquiry.

THE INDIAN NIGHTMARE.

MR. LAING, formerly Finance Minister in India, in his thoughtful speech on the Eastern Question in the recent debate, though labouring under the unusual disadvantage of thoroughly understanding the subject which he discussed, has shown us as clearly as any proposition in Euclid, that it is impossible for Russia successfully to invade India, as an army of only 50,000 Russians would require 100,000 camels, 75,000 horses, and half a million of camp followers if they operated on the side of Afghanistan; while even if they acquired the Euphrates Valley as far as the Persian Gulf and forced on us, in spite of our strenuous opposition, the enormous benefit of a railway to that point, at a ruinous loss to themselves (as the French compelled our reluctant acceptance of the inestimable benefits of the Suez Canal), the British Fleet could prevent a Russian army even from embarking on the Persian Gulf to invade India on that side.

He further quoted Lord Hardinge's statement:—"As to a Russian invasion of India, depend upon it, it is a political nightmare;" and the Duke of Wellington's opinion: "Lord Hardinge is quite right. Rely upon it you have nothing to apprehend from Russia in that quarter." In fact, the Russians could more easily conquer China, with which it is already conterminous, and which contains treble the population of India.

Mr. Mackenzie Wallace, after an exhaustive study of Russia during six years, in his recent work, which has been most favourably noticed by all the most influential organs of the Press, says respecting this Indian Scare:—"If we could not repel the invasion of Russia, we have no right to hold India. . . . If the

native populations are so disaffected, it follows that our vaunted civilizing influence is merely a fine name for rule by terrorism."

The great majority of the Russophobists at the "west-end," however, in spite of any amount of incontrovertible facts and unanswerable arguments from such pre-eminent authorities as the Duke of Wellington and Lord Hardinge, are determined to believe in the Indian Scare, as it suits their wild and unpatriotic purpose of driving the nation into a war with our old and faithful ally Russia, to rivet the chains of the "unspeakable Turk" on the wretched Christians of that effete empire, on the specious pretext of British interests, and they are, or affect to be, as credulous on this subject as the "west-end" generally is about the ghost which is supposed to haunt one of the houses in Berkeley-square; and if the facts are against their favourite theories they simply say, "So much the worse for the facts."

Though it is self-evident that Russia cannot conquer India, it is quite possible that the people of India, after another mutiny, might obtain their independence; and I purpose, therefore, now to show what is the pecuniary value of India to us.

The very idea of such a supposed misfortune as the loss of India is enough to take away the breath of most Englishmen, who very erroneously suppose that India is, as it were, the key-stone of the arch on which the whole fabric of British prosperity rests, and that if such an event happened we must prepare for national bankruptcy and ruin, and for the speedy appearance of Macaulay's New Zealander, to contemplate the ruins of what was once a great country from a broken arch of London Bridge.

Mr. Bright, however, and many other men of eminence, so far from being anxious to retain India at any cost, are in favour of our educating the various peoples of India to self-government, and that, as soon as this can be effected, we should then leave the country to govern itself, just as we gave up our rule over the Ionian Islands; and it seems strange that when even the Sultan has given a Constitution to Turkey, we should not give one considerably more liberal and effective to India.

So far from the possession of India being an unalloyed benefit

to us or to them, it involves very considerable drawbacks. It is an appalling consideration for England to have the responsibility for the happiness and well-being of nearly 200,000,000 of people resting on its shoulders, and to have no certainty that we govern them with their free consent, and that if a *plébiscite* were taken we should not be bound in honour to leave the country.

It is now a settled maxim of English policy that if Canada, Australia, or any other colony wished to separate from us and become independent, we should say, as General Scott and a large minority of the Americans said on the occasion of the Secession, "Wayward sisters, go in peace;" but the British trade with Canada and Australia alone is £61,678,583, or about 10 per cent. more than that of India; and how could we consistently reimpose our sway on India if another mutiny drove us out, and a stable government was formed, or if we granted India a free Constitution and an overwhelming majority voted against the continuance of our rule?

The possession of India, in the opinion of most statesmen, compels the retention of the abominable and disgraceful opium traffic, which produced £8,556,629, out of a total Indian revenue of £50,570,171 in 1873-74, or more than a sixth; and this trade involves us in periodical wars with China, to force the Government of that country to allow their people, at the point of the bayonet, to receive this deleterious drug, which has more than anything else demoralized a nation numbering about half the human race. Again, we have to keep up a force of about 70,000 British troops in India, the result being that, in case of an invasion of England or an European war, our military resources are greatly diminished.

An Indian engineer, too, wrote some very able letters in the *Times*, some years ago, in which he held the distressing opinion that the very excellence of our rule was its greatest fault, since, without famine, pestilence, and the sword, the population was rapidly outgrowing its means of subsistence. It is also the opinion of most missionaries that the influence of our bad example is the great obstacle to the spread of Christianity in

India, on the belief in which, according to the Athanasian Creed, which is generally swallowed by the "west-end," the eternal salvation of 190,000,000 of human beings depends. If, as is so often and so recklessly asserted, our rule in India is equally beneficial to England and to our Indian subjects, it follows that on the occasion of the Crimean War, and at any future time when we conceive we are obliged to fight for India, half the cost of the war should be defrayed out of Indian resources, and the other half partly out of British and partly out of colonial resources, since we are such grand signors as, apparently, to consider it ungentlemanly and mean to make our defeated enemy pay the costs of the war, as the Germans did in the case of the Franco-German War.

It appears from the annual statement of the trade of the United Kingdom, presented to Parliament for 1875, that the total amount of the imports from India in that year was £30,137,295, and of the exports to India, not only of British but also of foreign and colonial produce, £25,595,115, together, £55,732,410, while the total export and import trade of Great Britain was £655,551,900; so that, after all, our Indian trade is only about 8 per cent. of the whole. Our trade with India amounts to about 6s. per head of population, as against a trade of about 7s. 5d. per head, or nearly 25 per cent. more, with Protectionist and much-abused Russia, while our commerce with that model of perfection, Free-trade Turkey, is only about 9s. per head, or about 20 per cent. more than that with Russia.

I will assume that the profits of our trade with India are 10 per cent., which I am informed on good authority is a high average, and this would give about 5½ millions sterling as the real profit which we derive from it. Now, as Messrs. Jones, Lloyd, and Co.'s bank was sold about 12 years ago to the London and Westminster bank for five years' purchase of the net profit, I think I am overstating the case in placing a similar value on the profits of our trade with India, especially with the imminent danger which we run, according to the "west-end," of being peprived by Russia, to say nothing about the chances of our

being driven out of it by another mutiny, or voted out, if we give them a Constitution.

This would give £27,500,000 as the present value of our trade with India, or about one-third of what the Crimean War cost us to preserve this very trade, of which we should not have lost a farthing if there had been no Crimean War.

But even if we lost India, how can it be shown that our trade with it would diminish? The new Government would have every motive for increasing rather than curtailing their exports to England, while as to the imports into India of English produce, a considerable portion of which consists of foreign and colonial goods, it seems to be forgotten that no advantage is now given in India to British produce more than to that of any other country, and that a considerable protective duty is levied by us, though professing free traders, on British cotton goods imported into India. Why should India, if independent, take dearer and inferior produce from other countries in preference to better and cheaper articles from Britain?

In addition, however, to our trade with India, it may be said that we have other important interests, and these are—The Indian Debt, amounting to £107,368,949; Capital Stock of the East India Company, £12,000,000; Railway Stock, £95,119,119; total, £214,488,068. And two more Crimean wars, and another Afghan war would cost us as much, with the wars for India which preceded it, as the whole value of our stock in India of every description But a very considerable portion of this sum is held in India or by foreigners, and there is the house, land, and other property owned by Englishmen. There are, again, the claims of officers of the civil and military services in India to compensations—pensions and retiring allowances, but clearly if Mr. Bright's plan were carried out, and if in a few years the people of India were sufficiently educated to undertake the sole charge of governing themselves, we could and would stipulate that all these obligations should be honourably and faithfully fulfilled; and as Japan, Egypt, and other States of similar character to that of India, punctually pay the interest on

their debts, there is no reason why the people of India, grateful to us for our paternal government, and remembering that, unlike Holland, we exacted no tribute from them, should not regularly and honestly perform promises, on the faith of which we had made them independent.

A signal instance of the folly and wickedness of going to war for supposed or inadequate "British interests" without previously calculating their real value, is furnished by the American War of Independence, which we undertook in order to extort from our colonies a paltry tea duty of 3d. per pound, which at the same rate per head of population as the produce of the present English duty would have produced £150,000 a year gross, but which, as tea was then enormously dear, and our colonists were then poorer and less luxurious than we now are, would probably, after deducting the cost of collection, not have realized more than £50,000 a year. Lord Chatham, and most of our greatest statesmen, held that we were not entitled to tax the colonies for our benefit, and we do not now attempt to do so in the case of any of them. Yet, we fought for nearly ten years for this wretched stake, and even let loose the Red Indian savages to scalp, mutilate, and massacre them; and in the end, though our population was 7,227,586, against a colonial population of 2,614,300, with a little assistance from the French (which was greater odds than those of the Russians against the Turks, besides our having the command of the sea, which the Russians have not), our armies were compelled to surrender, and we were obliged to make peace (little more than 90 years ago), after an outlay on the war of £124,000,000, which would have been a ridiculous price to pay for even the gross produce of the tea tax at the present English rate of consumption; for at the usual present rate of interest on American securities this £150,000 a year would be only worth £3,000,000, while we spent more than 40 times as much in attempting to secure this tea duty, and failed to get it, to say nothing of the thousands of priceless lives sacrificed on both sides, and the permanent alienation of as loyal and attached Englishmen as any in the world.

With reference to the trade of the Black Sea, supposing that Russia not only obtained the whole of it, but even annexed European Turkey, which has a population of 8,315,000, and if the Russian tariff were established, the loss of trade to us, being the difference between 7s. 5d. in Russia per head and 9s. in Turkey (supposing the Russian tariff to be established), would be only £656,600 a year; and on the profits of this trade only £65,000 a year would be lost to us, while we should gain enormously in the long run, since the best authorities are agreed that Turkey does not contain more than one-fifth part of the population which it could maintain, or than it formerly possessed, and at this rate we lose a trade of nearly £50,000,000, which we should enjoy if Turkey were adequately populated, even if the Russian tariff were not reduced, as it most probably will be. Mr. Mackenzie Wallace justly observes, as to the Black Sea question, "The possession of the Dardanelles gives naval supremacy in the Black Sea and not in the Mediterranean, and in the event of a war it can matter little to us whether the Russian fleet is shut up in the Black Sea or in the harbour of Sebastopol; in either case it is quite harmless so far as the Mediterranean and our communication with India are concerned."

Lord Derby has recently intimated to Russia that if she presumed to exercise her full belligerent right by blockading the Suez Canal, we should consider it a "menace to India." As we have given a similar notice to Turkey, we have committed another breach of the Treaty of Paris, and another infringement of the independence of Turkey. But how can it be shown that if Russia, exercising her legitimate right of conquest, annexed Egypt, our empire in India would be menaced? It would be the interest of Russia to keep open the Suez Canal when at peace with England, and if we were at war with her we should have command of the sea, and we should be no worse off than we were before the opening of the Suez Canal. Russia could not menace India though it possessed Egypt, because our fleet would effectually prevent any force ever being embarked from Egypt for the invasion of India. We should never have

dared to treat the United States as we are now treating Russia during the War of Secession, when the Northern States illegally blockaded the Southern States without recognizing them as belligerents, though the consequences to us were infinitely more serious than the occupation of Egypt by Russia, since it produced a cotton famine and threw our factory hands into a state of destitution and misery, besides enormously diminishing our exports.

It appears that Count Schouvaloff has arrived in London with a letter to Lord Derby, stating that Russia does not intend to blockade or otherwise interfere with the Suez Canal; and as Turkey has the command of the sea as against Russia, it is obvious that the threatening and insulting communication of Lord Derby was altogether unnecessary.

The *Times* judiciously observes:—"The real interests of England being those of general peace and freedom, the community of states tends to find its interests identical with hers. As her commerce is connected with that of the whole world, it is protected by the natural advantages of international trade. As she does not seek conquest she does not invite aggression. Such is the answer to those who say that a naval power like Italy or France might attack our communications with the East. It would never do so lightly, because its own interests lie in the same line with ours. If it were at war with this country, its naval stations in the Mediterranean Sea would no doubt arm it with a powerful weapon. But to declare war rather than permi such stations to be constructed would be wasteful folly, since it might involve an expenditure of a hundred millions directly, to ward off a danger which might never approach. The wiser course would be to increase our navy in the Mediterranean. By paying a somewhat higher premium on our naval insurance policy, in the shape of a slight addition to the estimates, we could neutralise the possibilities of danger. It is cheaper to pay a million a year for a time than to fling two or three hundred millions away at once in a rash war."

"WE MUST RECONSTRUCT THE GREEK EMPIRE."—*Duke of Wellington*, 1829.

THIS momentous sentence from one of the greatest of English heroes, who had been previously one of the staunchest supporters of the integrity of Turkey, and one of the greatest opponents of the independence of Greece, ought to have the strongest possible weight with all Englishmen, and more especially with the Conservative party, of which he was the consistent and powerful champion. Now, however, the Philo-Turkish party are so obstinately wedded to their prejudices in favour of Mahometan tyranny, that even the great name of the Duke of Wellington is no talisman against their attacks; and since I stated in my speech in the House of Commons that the Iron Duke had expressed his regret that the Russians had made peace at Adrianople, instead of taking Constantinople (which he positively states they might have done) and dissolving the Turkish Empire, some of the strongest partisans of Turkey say that after all the Duke was not a great statesman.

I am astonished and ashamed to have to defend the reputation of the Great Duke as a statesman against the attacks of Conservatives; but I shall do so, not in my own insignificant language, but in the words of one of the most eminent statesmen of modern times, M. Thiers, who, as a Frenchman who made an idol of Napoleon, can hardly be suspected of any undue prejudice in favour of the great British general who destroyed the power of Napoleon at Waterloo, and marched triumphantly to Paris.

M. Thiers says truly and candidly, but reluctantly : "There is no use denying it—every circumstance considered, the Duke of Wellington was the greatest general whom the late wars have offered for contemplation. His mind was so equally poised, notwithstanding the vivacity of his genius, that he was always ready and equally prompt on every occasion. He united the powerful combination of Napoleon to the steady judgment of Moreau. No man can deny to him the most equable judgment that was ever met with in a great soldier."

The Duke was by education and temperament a Conservative, and as such his naturally excellent judgment was sometimes warped by the prejudices of his party, and more especially on the Greek and Turkish questions. But the force of his intellect, and the reach and acuteness of his vision, is shown by the fact that he was the first great statesman to prophecy the dissolution of the Ottoman Power, and to see that the only effectual and legitimate solution of the Eastern Question is the re-establishment of the Greek Empire.

It is equally strange and humiliating to an Englishman to reflect that after all the immeasurable obligations under which the whole civilized world lie to the Greek race—by far the noblest and greatest which has ever existed—we should not only have refused their entreaties for assistance when they struggled for their independence, but should also have persistently and uniformly for six long years, with the other powers of Europe, refrained from taking up their cause.

The Greeks may be said to have invented European civilization, the only civilization worthy of the name. Thousands of years ago the immortal poems of Homer, the tragedies of Sophocles, the wisdom of Socrates and of Plato, the science of Euclid, the sculpture of Phidias, sprang into existence almost from nothing. In every department of literature, philosophy, and taste, the Greeks sprung, as it were, at a bound, not only to the highest eminence, but to an elevation which after thousands of years, with all the advantages of their labours, we have never succeeded in rivalling.

If the Greeks had never existed, we might probably have been now roaming as savages in the woods and wastes of Britain, for it is wildly improbable that that divine spark which animated the Greeks would ever have been illumined in any other race. Not only in every walk of literature, in science, in philosophy, in architecture, in painting, in sculpture and in music, did the Greeks excel, but their bravery in the field was something almost more than mortal, and their heroic conduct at Marathon and Salamis has never been surpassed since the world began; and the victories of the Greeks against the Persians repelled the barbaric hordes from Europe, which would have overwhelmed our civilization. There are those, however, who are too dull and matter-of-fact to be alive to our indelible and immeasurable obligations to that race of demigods—the ancient Greeks; and who, moreover, say that even if they possessed all the qualities claimed for them by their grateful admirers, the present race of Greeks is degenerate and unworthy. But I shall now prove by historical facts which cannot be denied that the Greeks are still worthy of our highest esteem and regard, and that in their War of Independence they developed an amount of bravery in no respect inferior to that of the heroes of Marathon and Salamis; and the glories of the renaissance, and of the revival of learning from the darkness of the Middle Ages, were the result of Greek literature and taste introduced by the refugees on the conquest of Constantinople. It should be borne in mind that before the war of independence the Greeks had been enslaved by the overwhelming masses of the Turkish hordes for nearly 400 years, during the whole of which period they had been deprived of the use of arms, and that the strongest and most promising of their male children were annually taken from them as tribute children, by an unprecedented refinement of cruelty brought up as Mahometans, enrolled among the janissaries, and sent, ignorant of their birth and lineage, to oppress their own kindred; whilst the ancient Greeks had been always free, and trained from their youth to the use of arms.

Odysseus, one of the Greek chiefs, thus explained to Mahomet Pacha why the Greeks took up arms:—"It was the injustice of

the viziers, waywodes, cadis, and Baloukbashis, each of whom closed the book of Mahomed and opened a book of his own. Any virgin that pleased them they took by force; any merchant in Negroponte who was making money they beheaded and seized his goods; any proprietor of a good estate they slew and occupied his property; and every drunken vagabond in the streets would murder respectable Greeks, and was not punished for it." The whole of the Christian or Infidel dogs had to purchase their lives annually by the capitation tax called "redemption of the price of heads;" and no one, not even the Turks, could have an hereditary right to an estate, and if the proprietor died without a male child, the property went to the Sultan, to the exclusion of the daughters; whilst if there were sons, their right of succession was restored by a payment of one-tenth of the value, so that if a similar system was established in England, a man succeeding to an estate of £1,000 a year, which might be saleable at thirty years' purchase, would pay £3,000 immediately, whereas in England it would only be about £250, payable by instalments spread over a long time. The only way in which property can be settled in perpetuity is by leaving it in trust to a mosque, and about three-fourths of the surface of Turkey is thus in the hands of the mosques, who release it to the owners for a ransom; and no Christian can become a landed proprietor,—whilst the situations of vizier, cadi, pasha, and the like, are sold to the highest bidder.

The Greek revolution was preceded by a very melancholy event, which awakened the sympathy of Europe, and showed in the most convincing manner the fearful oppression under which the Greeks had so long groaned, and the ardent patriotism of that unfortunate nation.

The town of Parga, which is on the seacoast of the mainland opposite the Ionian Islands, was transferred from the French to Great Britain in 1814; but the treaty of 1815 did not mention it, and the Turks claimed it, as all the mainland was by that treaty awarded to them. The inhabitants took the alarm, and the English governor promised that the place should not be delivered

up till the property of those who might choose to emigrate should be paid for, and they themselves be transferred to the Ionian Islands; and they unanimously "resolved to abandon their country rather than stay in it with dishonour, and that they would disinter and burn the bones of their forefathers." The property of the people was estimated at £500,000, but the Turks would not pay more than one-third of the real value. In June, 1819, every family marched solemnly out of its dwelling; and the men, preceded by their priests, proceeded to the sepulchres of their fathers, and silently unearthed and collected their remains, which they put upon a huge pile of wood, to which they set fire, and stood motionless and silent till all was consumed. The Turks became impatient to get into the town, but the citizens told the governor that if a single Mussulman was admitted before the remains of their ancestors were secured from profanation, and themselves with their families safely embarked, they would instantly put to death their wives and children, and die with arms in their hands, after having taken a bloody revenge on those who had bought and sold their country. The remonstrance was successful; the march of the Mussulmans was arrested, the pile burnt out, and the people embarked in silence with their wives and children. The Mussulmans soon after entered, and they found only one single inhabitant in the place, and he was drunk, and lying near the yet smoking pile!

Parga was taken possession of by the British in 1814, upon a specific engagement with the heroic people of that town (who had a few months previously repulsed 20,000 Turks from its walls) that it was to follow the fate of the Ionian Islands. Parga was a free state. For three or four centuries it had cherished the spirit of liberty, while the countries around had been enslaved; yet we, by design or by culpable carelessness, surrendered this magnanimous people to the "unspeakable Turk." In the debate in 1819 Mr. Scarlett (afterwards Lord Abinger) said, "I look upon the surrender of Parga as an act as treacherous and perfidious as has ever disgraced modern diplomacy;" and Sir James Mackintosh called it "as perfidious a transfer as could ever disgrace any free

country. . . . The cession of Parga would be, I maintain, the most abominable that ever was made of or by a free people. There was no example among nations where faith was kept of giving up a free and Christian people to a Mahometan tyrant."

I have already briefly narrated in another part of this work the statistics of the massacre of Chios, and other Turkish atrocities; and I might now advert to the massacre at Adrianople of many thousand Greeks—which was so atrocious that even the European diplomatists interfered, and obtained the dismissal of the Grand Vizier who had instigated it—and the massacre at Smyrna of a still larger number of Christians and the forced exile of 15,000; but the reader will already, not only have supped full of horrors, but have dined and breakfasted on so many, that I will for a while spare him, and proceed to the case of Cyprus, which had a population in ancient times of above a million, which had sunk in 1826 to about 70,000, of whom half were Christians and half Mahometans; and of the 35,000 Christians a large portion were now massacred, and their wives and daughters violated, or sold to Turkish harems.

After the defeat at Armoughi in 1823, 600 women and children who had taken refuge in the grotto of Stonorambella were, "after being blockaded for a month, inhumanly smoked to death like bees by the Turks."

In 1824 the greatest of modern poets, Lord Byron, threw in his lot, impaired his fortune, and sacrificed his invaluable life, in the glorious cause of Greek independence. Yet Europe for three years longer cynically and ungratefully looked on at this heroic struggle, and the Austrian Avisos gave information, obtainable only by a neutral, to the Turks, as to the position, numbers, and movements of the Greek fleets and armies.

In the same year (1824) the garrison of Ipsara, hopeless of relief and having lost two-thirds of their number, determined to perish like the Three Hundred at Thermopylæ. They sent a soldier with a lighted torch to fire a powder-magazine *outside the walls*; and as he fell, pierced by several balls, before reaching it, five others were sent on a similar errand, and all shared the same fate. Upon this

the Greeks resolved to blow themselves up with the powder they had within the monastery, but in such a way as to involve their enemies in their ruin. They ceased firing, accordingly, for some time; and the Turks, thinking the defenders had all fallen, after a pause rushed tumultuously forward to the assault of the walls, which were scaled on every side. Suddenly the Hellenic flag was lowered, a white flag bearing the words "Liberty or Death" waved in the air, a signal gun was discharged, and, immediately after, a rumbling noise, followed by a loud explosion, was heard, and the monastery, with the whole of its defenders and thousands of its assailants, was blown into the air. The Turks after their victory sent 500 heads and 1,000 ears to Constantinople, which were displayed in ghastly rows at the gate of the Seraglio. Ten females only were made slaves, for the Psarriotte women, in an heroic spirit, drowned themselves, with their infants, to avoid becoming the spoil of the victors, and forty years later, in 1867, a similar holocaust was offered up by the Cretan insurgents at the monastery of Arkali.

Thus had the Greeks, in the fourth year of the war, with a population of only five hundred thousand souls—or, say one hundred and twenty-five thousand fighting-men, repelled the forces of an empire of thirty-five millions of men, or seventy times their number,—a feat quite as heroic as that of the ancient Greeks in resisting Xerxes.

In 1825 the Turks, after ravaging the plains of the Morea, and burning the houses, drove away the inhabitants as slaves without mercy. A market was opened at Modon for the sale of captives of both sexes, who were crowded in dungeons loaded with irons, unmercifully beaten by their guards, and often murdered in pure wanton cruelty during the night. Such, indeed, was the severity with which they were treated, that, in comparison with it, the old Turkish system of beheading or blowing from the mouth of a gun every male person above sixteen might be considered as merciful.

At the siege of Missolonghi, in 1826, the Turks impaled alive in front of their lines a priest, two women, and several children;

yet the brave garrison, in spite of want of ammunition and food, refused to surrender.

In 1826 the Greek Government was in such miserable financial straits that the treasury contained only sixteen piastres, or about five shillings; yet they continued the war, and on the 7th of October in that year the heroic Greeks, with a fleet of only 14 small vessels, drove 40 sail of large Turkish vessels ignominiously before them to Constantinople. The result of the bravery of the Greeks was that all the Turkish corps which were marched overland into Greece melted away by desertion. Such was the horror at the Greek war which pervaded all classes of the Ottomans.

At last the lethargic conscience and the dormant sympathy of Europe was awakened, and some faint and half-hearted efforts were made to intervene in favour of Greece; but it was by accident, and not by design, that the Battle of Navarino was fought, by which the successful issue of the struggle was at last made certain.

The very insignificant share of credit which devolved on England for its conduct during the Greek war of independence and the cynical disregard of the British Government for the most ordinary feelings of humanity, will appear from the following extract from Bulwer's *Life of Lord Palmerston*:—

"When first came the account that the fleet of 40 sail, which left Navarino in December, after Codrington's boasted annihilation of the Turkish fleet, and which consisted of 17 sail that had actually got into Navarino after the battle, although Codrington was ordered to prevent any sea movement,—when accounts came that this fleet had carried away five or six thousand Greek slaves, I called the attention of the Cabinet to this circumstance, and urged that it would be a stain on our national character if we did not make an effort to recover these *wretches. The Duke received the proposition coldly; Aberdeen treated it as a thing we had no right to interfere with; Bathurst as the exercise of a legitimate right on the part of the Turks, and Ellenborough as rather a laudable action.* Peel showed me a despatch by which it appeared that the practice of the Egyptians had been, from

the time they first entered the Morea, to consider the Greek population as a preserve of slaves. . . . The total number thus seized, first and last, was from fifteen to twenty thousand. . . . Pozzo said that 640 slaves had been redeemed by the French Government, and he believed (though I do not) that the English Government had contributed something towards the expense of this redemption."

The opinion which Lord Palmerston entertained on the Greek question is further shown by the following extract:—

"*Memorandum on Greek affairs sent by Lord Palmerston to Lord Goderich, Dec. 6th,* 1827.—Persuasion, reasoning, and threat having failed to sway the Porte, actual coercion must be resorted to; and it only remains to be considered what shall be the action and extent of that coercion, and where it can be the most effectually applied. We have at present in Portugal 5,000 men. Why should not that force, instead of coming home, be sent to the Ionian Islands? We have already 5,000 men at Malta and the Ionian Islands. From these and from Sir W. Clinton's division, and landing detachments of marines and sailors from the fleet, it would be easy to land at least 8,000 men upon the Morea. If, however, it were thought that any force which we might thus be able to bring would be too small to secure a rapid and easy success, would it not be possible to persuade France to detach for that purpose some part of her troops in Spain? . . . and thus give in a short space of time the double example of England and France fighting side by side, both by land and sea.' This proposal was renewed by Lord Palmerston to the Duke of Wellington, when the Duke became head of the Cabinet, and the only objections which the Duke put forward were that less than 15,000 men would be too few, and that was more than we could conveniently send. These objections vanished in six months time, and the English Cabinet consented in July to what Lord Palmerston had proposed in December. The delay in enforcing the Treaty of London produced the very war which that treaty was intended to avert. The result to Turkey was much bloodshed and the conditions of the treaty of Adrianople; while the Greeks were the gainers, because

they obtained complete independence, instead of only that autonomy which was all that was originally contemplated by the allies."

And the discreditable course pursued by England is justly and severely censured in the following passage from Lord Palmerston's speech in 1829 :—

Lord Palmerston said: "The Morea, I say, has indeed been cleared. I wish the arms of England had had a more direct and prominent share in that honourable exploit. But why were the arms of France checked at the Isthmus of Corinth? Was it that France herself shrank back with alarm at the consequences of a further advance? or was it that the narrow policy of England stepped in and arrested her progress? Shall I be told—that the Morea and the Cyclades are to be liberated Greece, and that the Isthmus of Corinth is its northern boundary? I say that will not be—that cannot be; it is impossible that it should be. A larger and wider limit, extending at least to the line drawn from Volo to Arta, is indispensably necessary for Greece. . . . But in this, as in clearing the Morea, France will hold the first and England the second place. The merit of giving this extended limit will, in public opinion, be accorded to the enlightened liberality of France. France will have the credit of being supposed to have dragged England reluctantly after her. England will bear the odium of having vainly attempted to clog the progress of France. . . . I have seen that it has been said elsewhere that the allies are negotiating with Turkey. I should have thought that the allies had had enough of negotiating with Turkey about Greece, and that they had by this time discovered that *even Turkey herself would rather that on this subject they should dictate.* . . . I said that the delay in executing the treaty of July, 1827, had brought upon them that very evil of war in the east of Europe which that treaty was calculated to prevent. Have the Government laboured *bonâ fide* and in good earnest to bring about peace in the only way in which it can be accomplished? If they have not, and if by any want of resolution and decision they shall ultimately have endangered the tranquillity of all Europe; if, balancing between

a wish to assist Turkey and an inability to find any pretence for doing so, they have, by the ambiguity and mixed character of their language to Turkey, allowed her to be deceived by what she is to expect from England, and have thereby been instrumental in encouraging her resistance to a just accommodation; then, indeed, they will have incurred a responsibility which I should be sorry to share. . . . It is thus that they (Europe) see in the delay in executing the treaty of July, not so much fear of Turkish resistance as invincible repugnance to Grecian freedom."

The most distinguished hero of the Greek War of Independence (Canaris) still lives, and quite recently, though he has attained the age of ninety years, he has been chosen Premier of Greece by the unanimous voice of his countrymen.

"Fifty-six years ago he was the captain of a small vessel trading peacefully between Constantinople and Odessa. He had taken no part in the intrigues which produced the insurrection, and his personal safety was secure. He was no adventurer, but a law-abiding citizen, with wife and children; no glory hunter, but a man content to live a quiet and humble life. For more than a year after the rising of his countrymen he remained in obscurity, and not until the massacre of the innocent Chians had sent a thrill of horror through the length and breadth of Christendom was his name heard. Then he performed those wonderful feats of daring with his fire ships against the ferocious Turks which so powerfully contributed to the establishment of Greek independence, and he struck such terror into the officers and crews of the Turkish fleet that, with only fourteen small vessels, he chased forty large Turkish men-of-war to Constantinople, where they were laid up. It is hard to find, in the history of Greece, a parallel to the heroism of Canaris. Cincinnatus, retiring to his farm from the Dictatorship of Rome and returning to power at the importunities of his fellow citizens, seems to have been such a man as Canaris. He was raised to the rank of Admiral and made a Senator, but he lives at a little hamlet—an oasis in the desertthat stretches around Athens. He spends the autumn of life in gardening, carpentering, and feeding the chickens. . . .

His chamber, destitute of the most ordinary luxuries, seemed a fitting shrine for the honest soul within it, for he voluntarily ends his life surrounded by the homeliness and frugality with which it began."—*Times.*

So acute, energetic, and business-like is the modern Greek, that he has driven the merchants of all other nations from various branches of trade, especially that in corn, of which the Greeks have almost a monopoly; and in Odessa, Marseilles, Manchester, and even London, the Greek merchants beat the Russians, the Frenchmen, and the Englishmen, on their own soil.

Historians have calculated that between those who were massacred, those who were killed in battle, and those who were sold into a slavery worse than death, one-half of the population of Greece had perished in the struggle for freedom and independence, and yet there are ignorant and prejudiced people who affect to undervalue this heroic struggle!

In the Franco-German War the French submitted to a peace dictated by the Germans, by which they surrendered two provinces, and were compelled to pay an indemnity of £200,000,000, after an estimated loss of less than 100,000 men killed, and about 360,000 prisoners led into a humane and temporary captivity; but, to enable them to rank with the heroic Greeks, they would have had to resist till no less than 20,000,000 had either been killed or taken prisoners—though the fate of the latter would have been immeasurably superior to that of the Greeks who were sold as slaves.

Russia has now a unique and unrivalled opportunity of proving her magnanimity, disinterestedness, and regard for the general interests of humanity by restoring the Greek Empire.

The *Times* of June 9th, states: "The defect of our policy in relation to Russia—a defect inevitably fatal to its ultimate success—is that it demands the permanent barbarism, desolation, and inaccessibility of all the countries from the Adriatic to the Chinese Empire—a large part of the Eastern Hemisphere. Because we have 'interests' in India, and the increase of Russian power might at some remote time, and under certain improbable

incommode us on our way thither, therefore no be permitted on any portion of the globe contiguous ussian Empire. The lands most blessed by Nature, the mous in history, must remain for ever the abode of sloth arbarianism, most sealed to the traveller, the population hing, the villages falling into ruin, the desert advancing. is said to be British policy."

Anything more inhuman and utterly abominable than such a licy cannot well be imagined, and a people who avowed they re actuated by it would deserve to be treated, like pirates, as emies to the human race.

Let Russia set us and the world a grand and almost unparalleled ample of magnanimity by restoring the Greek Empire. Russia as now two gates to its commerce: the key of the one (the ound) is safely intrusted to Denmark; surely it would be far better to intrust the other to their co-religionists, the enterprising and civilized Greeks, who would be eternally grateful for this magnificent gift, than to leave it with the effete, barbarous, and hostile Turks.

To put the matter on a lower ground: Russia would obviously be in a stronger position relatively to the Greek Empire, supposing it to extend to the Balkans, which would include a population of only about seven millions, which would be largely diminished by an emigration of Turks to Asia,—than if the key of their Southern commerce remained in the hands of the forty-eight millions who inhabit the present Turkish Empire. There is plenty of room for any Sclavonians who now live south of the Balkans in the territory north of that range, which has not a quarter of the population that it formerly possessed, and the Greeks would buy out the Sclavonians and Turks as they formerly did in Greece.

As long as the Turks remain at Constantinople there can be no permanent peace; and if the Greek Empire had been established in 1829, as the Duke of Wellington desired, Russia would have been saved the enormous cost in human life and in money of the Crimean war, of that in which they are now engaged against Turkey, and of

the future wars which they will have yet to wage against a barbarous country—and possibly against some of the European Powers—if this war has any other result than the establishment of the Greek Empire; whilst if they once proclaim this intention, the sympathies of the civilized world would be in their favour, and, not only the kingdom of Greece, but all the Greeks throughout European Turkey, would rise to a man in their favour, and the Turkish Empire would be instantly dissolved.

By altering one or two words, a remarkable sentence which Tocqueville applies to the jealousy of aristocracy among American democrats applies accurately to the idiotic, suicidal, and dog-in-the-manger mutual jealousies between the Greeks and the Slavonians. "I think that the Slavonians have a natural taste for liberty. Left to themselves, they seek after it. They love it, and they grieve with pain that they are deprived of it. But they have against the Greeks an ardent, insatiable, eternal, invincible jealousy. They wish liberty, with the possession of a large portion of the ancient limits of Greece, and if they cannot obtain it, they wish it still in slavery. They will suffer poverty, serfdom, barbarism, but they will not suffer a Greek Empire." The mutual jealousies of Greek and Slav have retained them both under the oppressive rule of the barbarous Turk for centuries, and if it goes on, hundreds of years more may elapse before they are free and independent. The whole world, except the Slavonians, is utterly opposed to the acquisition of ancient Macedonia and Thrace, or any part of them, by any other race than the Greeks, to whom they originally belonged; and, though they may keep the Greeks out by maintaining the Ottoman Empire, they never can possess any territory south of the Balkans, the ancient Mount Hœmus of Greece. Panslavism is a chimæra as much as Pan-Latinism would be for the purpose of uniting France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy into one Latin confederation. Pan-Gallicanism, which would be opposed to the death by the Belgians, the Swiss, the French Canadians, and the people of the Channel Islands, or Pan Anglo-Saxonism, which has not yet been even heard of; and even Pan-Scandinavianism, though there is much

more similarity between the Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes than among the Slavonians, has been abandoned as an impracticable scheme.

It appears that at the Slavonian Congress, held in 1866, at Moscow, the German language was chosen as the only possible medium of intercommunication between the different Slav deputies, whose various idioms were incomprehensible to each other. See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1st September, 1867.

I may add that these leaky *Pans* are usually covered with a poisonous moral verdigris, and that no amount of *tin* will ever make them safe and watertight.

The reader will find in the complete edition of my work on the Eastern Question an ethnological map, which is indispensable to anyone who wishes to discover a just and permanent solution to the Eastern Question, and I would strongly recommend its study to all who wish to understand the Eastern Question. The numbers and influence of the Greek race in European Turkey have been very much underrated not only by Slavonic writers but by the Germans, who seek to hold a supremacy over the non-Russian Slavonians through the Hungarians who dominate the Slavonic races of Austria.

Besides the prevailing fallacy as to the prevalence of the Slavonian element south of the Balkans, especially in Macedonia and Thrace, from which it is utterly incredible that the prevailing and ancient Greek element should have been eradicated any more than in Greece proper, the fact is that there are, both in Turkey in Europe and Asia Minor, Christian peoples who, although in their religious rites, their schools, and their official relations, they use the Greek tongue, are mistaken for Turks because they have been obliged to adopt the Turkish vernacular; and that they are not Turks in race is certain, because there is no instance of any Mahometan people embracing Christianity, and if they did they would have used the Turkish language as the Russians use Russian in their religious rites; besides, death is the punishment of all Mussulmans who abandon their religion. It is only the European Turks who are permitted to be called Osmanlis; they

look upon the Asiatic Turks as an inferior race, since the Osmanlis in Europe perform no manual labour, whereas in Asiatic Turkey they do. The Osmanlis have even a proverb, "Bin Turk bir toorp yazek toorp!" a thousand Turks for a radish. Poor radish! at being valued so cheap" (Adolphus Slade's "Record of Travel"). The Bosnian and Herzegovinian Mahometans, the Pomak in Bulgaria, and the Balaadés, or true believers, in Macedonia, and the Toshks and Ghegs in Albania, and a large population in Crete, who are all, by way of being Mahometans, use exclusively the Greek language, and you may hear them saying, "By the Holy Virgin, I am a Mahometan."

Before the Greek war of independence 50,000 Turks were settled in Greece, but with the exception of a small Mussulman community in the south of Eubœa, all have emigrated. Mr. Eton, in his "Survey of the Turkish Empire," says of the Albanian Mahometans, "They look on the Turks with the utmost contempt. . . . They know little of their religion, and pay little regard to it. Their women are not veiled; they drink wine, and intermarry with the Christians. It is true, indeed, that they will not eat pork, but if the husband and wife are of different religions they make no scruple of boiling in the same pot a piece of pork and a piece of mutton."

Mr. Thornton says, in his "Present State of Turkey," "Professed Mahometans have even related to me the miracles of Christian saints on behalf of the independence of their country." . . . Greek characters are used in writing Albanian, and Mathieu says in "La Turquie et ses Differents Peuples," "The Albanian Mussulmans are still more hostile to the Turks than their Christian brethren, and it is from them that those revolts have come which have so often enfeebled the Ottoman Power, and a change of circumstances would probably cause a new change of religion."

The difference in language between the Ghegs and the Toshks in Albania is so great that common intercourse through one of their special idioms is impossible, and there are few Albanians who do not speak Greek, that being their only medium for intellectual and commercial communion. Indeed, the Bible was not trans-

lated into the Albanian dialect of Greek till 1830. Mathieu says, "Numerous Albanian villages occupy Macedonia and Thrace, or Greece, and never does the least dissension arise between them and the Greeks. The famous tribe of the Suliotes, who took so active and glorious a part in the struggle for Greek emancipation, is even of pure Albanian race. . . . The Albanians of the south tend to become amalgamated with Greece." The Bulgarians themselves are not a pure Slavonic race, but are chiefly of Tartar origin. South of the Balkans there are many villages with Bulgarian names, but all the towns have remained Greek, and most of the so-called Bulgarians south of the Balkans are of Hellenic descent, and may be called Bulgarophone Greeks, for they are of the Greek type, and their character, manners, customs, and dress are Greek, whilst those north of the Balkans have the Mongolian type, and dress in the pootoor (breeches, large and full to the knee, and tight round the leg to the ankle) and the characteristic cylindrical-shaped cap or calpak of sheepskin, whilst the language of the Bulgarophone Greek contains an immense admixture of Greek words, totally unintelligible to northern Bulgarians.

M. Cousiniery, for many years French Consul, says in his "Voyage dans le Macedoine," "The Bulgarians pride themselves on being Greeks;" and Ubicini says, "This supremacy of the Greeks lasts still at the present day; the best schools are possessed and directed by Greeks, and it is the general opinion that where their influence ceases to manifest itself barbarism commences." Many of the Bulgarians south of the Balkans remain faithful to the Church of Constantinople, whereas those north of the Balkans have an independent Church of their own. Mr. McFarlane, in "Kismet," says, "In Thrace there are Bulgarian shepherds and farm labourers, but these do not bring their families with them, and they generally come down in the spring and return in the autumn to their own country. Mr. Layard confidently affirmed that the Greek population in all European Turkey was only 1,750,000. I believe that if you multiplied his figures by two you would get nearer the amount." In Macedonia the Sandjaks of Salonica, Cassandra, Berria, and Serres, numbering in all 250,000

souls, are almost purely Greek. In Thessaly, the only other race, the Turks, are daily being Hellenized; indeed, all the Turks of Larissa now speak Greek, and almost all the Southern Albanians have adopted the Greek language. M. Mathieu, in his work already quoted, "La Turquie et ses Differents Peuples, 1857," gives the number of Greeks in European Turkey at 2,540,000, and the Albanians at 850,000; and if we add those Albanians who are Greek in religion and in language, we shall arrive at a total of about 3,000,000, whilst he estimates the Bulgarians at 2,800,000, most of whom are north of the Balkans.

It is difficult to mention with too much commendation the admirable ethnological and statistical work by M. Bianconi, the French ex-engineer-in-chief of the Turkish railways from 1872 to 1876, Member of the Geographical Society of France, published in May, 1877, by Lassailly, of 61, Rue Richelieu, Paris.

The same intelligent and well-informed author has also published another more detailed work called "La Verité sur la Turquie." M. Bianconi has possessed unrivalled opportunities of studying the geography and ethnology of Turkey, from having been, for upwards of four years, not only resident like a consul, but specially occupied in surveying the country for railways.

His work is characterised by the most absolute and laudable impartiality as between the rival claims of the Slavonian, Greek, and other races, and while he unsparingly denounces the oppression of the Turkish Government, he holds the scales equally and without bias between Greek and Slav, speaking in kindly and sympathising language of both races, and of none more than the Bulgarians, who are, he says, "indefatigable labourers, gentle, peaceful in general, very poor, good fathers of families, and most obliging."

It is extremely satisfactory to me to find that the very valuable map appended to his work differs but slightly from mine, which is the same of which he speaks as Stanford's map. The difference between my map and his will be approximately understood by my readers, if they will look for Mangolia, on the Black Sea, which is M. Bianconi's northern land of the Greek race, and then proceed

westward to Dobrol, East Saghra, Tatar Bazardjik, Kouprala, and thence to Ergent on the Adriatic Sea, on the east coast of Albania. These limits can also be roughly traced in the ordinary map attached to the cheap edition of my work, and I have had a dotted line traced thereon, in accordance with M. Bianconi's views. It will be seen that M. Bianconi's boundary line between the Greeks and Bulgarians is slightly more favourable to the latter than that given in my Ethnological or Stanford map as regards the east and centre, but on the east mine is somewhat less favourable to the Greeks than that of M. Bianconi.

The map which was used at the Conference at Constantinople, in the absence of those of Stanford and M. Bianconi, which were not then published, was that of Kiepert, of which M. Bianconi speaks as follows :—

"The German geographer has not completed his work even in a topographical point of view; numerous errors appear in it as in that of others. In the centre of Turkey we have in our surveys proved considerable inaccuracies, found localities, water-courses, mountains even, which do not figure in the map of this famous geographer. . . . I must, however, avow here with regret that I, a French engineer, have had very often to show how much our maps are inferior to those of the Germans and Austrians, at least so far as Turkey is concerned." He thus shows that he has little or none of that national vanity which is so characteristic of the French.

M. Bianconi has, however, no prejudice in favour of the Stanford map, or the statistics which accompany it, while agreeing with it in the main, and regarding it as the best which had appeared prior to his own work, and he has freely pointed out what he conceives to be the faults of both; for instance, he inquires how it is that Stanford states that while there are 2,900,000 Mussulmans, there are only 1,120,000 Turks, but the difference is accounted for by the author by those Slavs, Greeks, and other races which have embraced, however reluctantly, Mahometanism. I myself am inclined to think that Stanford's statistics are in this instance inaccurate, and that M. Bianconi is

right in estimating the whole of the Mussulman race in Turkey at 1,410,000, of whom only 650,000 are Turks, the rest being Bosnians, Bulgarians, Albanians, and Greeks, who at heart are not Mussulmans, and would readily return to the faith of their fathers; so that if all the Turks had to leave Europe, there would only be about 150,000 families to dispose of in the rich and unoccupied lands of Asia Minor. Whilst the Bulgarians in Turkey are estimated by M. Bianconi at 3,100,000, of whom only about 600,000 are settled on the south side of the Balkans, against a Greek population in Turkey and Greece of 7,800,000, whereof about 60,000 live north of the Balkans, the Greek Christians in Turkey in Europe are in number 3,700,000, and, if we add the Albanians, 4,070,000, whilst the entire Greek race, including the Greek kingdom, number 7,800,000, and at no distant period, if the Greek Empire was re-established, it might become a first-rate power, with a population equal to what that of England was when she overthrew Napoleon.

M. Bianconi points out that while Western Europe believe that Turkey is as homogeneous an empire as it appears on the map, Egypt is only connected with Turkey by tribute; the provinces of Hedjaz and Yemen are no longer part of the Empire, and the immense countries which separate Bagdad from the country of Iram, for they provide no soldiers, and pay no taxes. The tribes of the Mirdites, the Dobri, the Koutchi, the Klementi, the Bamam, the Pulati, and the Mati, and the Isle of Samos, have never admitted on their territory Ottoman functionaries, and only pay a small tribute.

In Turkey, no part of the revenue is devoted to education, but there are still in Macedonia 34 Hellenic, 126 Primary, 57 Rudimentary, and 22 girls' schools, all Greek, with 10,918 scholars; and in Thrace 32 Hellenic, 102 Primary, 42 Rudimentary, and 15 girls' schools, also all Greek, with 13,564 pupils.

I think that these facts and figures sufficiently prove that if the Turkish Empire, as I believe and hope, is now to be dissolved, the Greek race are fairly entitled to the whole of Turkey to the line of the Balkans and to the southern half of Albania; but to

preserve the free navigation from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, all the forts of the Dardanelles should be destroyed, and the reconstructed Greek Empire should be prohibited from ever rebuilding them, whilst Russia may fairly claim maritime outlets for her commerce by annexing a port on the Syrian coast, of the Mediterranean and another on the Persian Gulf.

The Greeks were about to attack Turkey in aid of Russia during the Crimean War, but were prevented by the English and French fleets. Why should they not join Russia now, in which case, even if the Turks are allowed to retain Constantinople, Macedonia, and Thrace, they will, at least, make sure of Thessaly and Epirus, as well as probably Crete, and the other Greek islands. Surely half a loaf is better than no bread; and if they secure this first instalment of their right, they will the more readily afterwards obtain the remainder.

It is quite clear that in no country in the world are the Jews better treated in every respect than in Greece, as appears by the following letter published in the *Daily News* of Monday, October 30, 1876:—

"HONOURED SIR,—Being informed, to our great astonishment, that in your enlightened country there are some who erroneously imagine that the aliens in race and religion dwelling in Greece do not obtain at the hands of the Greek Government those rights which the laws confer upon Greek citizens, nor at the hands of the Greek people that fellow feeling which is an indispensable condition for the association in life of equal citizens, we consider it a duty imposed upon us by justice to declare before you, that being settled here from old, and forming a community of nearly five thousand, we live in perfect peace and in close friendliness with our fellow citizens and brethren the Greeks, obtaining the fullest liberty of conscience, possessing our own places of worship, enjoying equal political and civil rights, finding a full and impartial dispensation of justice at the Greek Courts of Law, and from all the other authorities, being in no way hindered in the exercise of our religion, and in no way disqualified among the rest of our

fellow-citizens with whom we serve in the army, and exercise in full liberty and perfect equality the same political rights, freely taking part in the parliamentary and municipal elections, by virtue of which some of us, having obtained the lawful majority, attained to the posts of communal councillors and aldermen, while others of us have exercised and still exercise the calling of lawyers and notaries at the law courts; finally, that we are not liable to any taxes heavier than those borne by the rest of the Hellenes, and that under the Hellenic Government we live in prosperity and happiness.

"We feel it our bounden duty to make these facts known; and expressing to you, Mr. Editor, and to the magnanimous British nation, our thanks for the wishes you have expressed in favour of an amelioration of the lot of the subjugated Greeks, we undersign ourselves,

"(Signed) SAMUEL B. RIETI,
A. L. DE SEMOS,
RAPHAEL D. JESHUA,
J. THEOPHILUS DE MARDO,
The Elders of the Jews in Corcyra."

"The Chief Rabbi of Corfu confirms the contents of the above document, and certifies to the authenticity of the foregoing signatures of Messieurs the Elders of the Jews in Corcyra.

"(Signed), JOSEPH E. LEVI,
"Corfu, Oct. 8 (20), 1876." The Chief Rabbi."

"I hereby certify to the authenticity of the foregoing signature of the Chief Rabbi of the Jewish community at Corcyra, Monsieur E. Levi. "(Signed), N. MARINOS, the Nomarch."
"Corfu, Oct. 11 (23), 1876."

"I hereby certify that the above signature of the Nomarch of this Island, N. Marinos, is genuine and authentic.

"(Signed), CHARLES SEBRIGHT,
"British Consulate, Corfu, Oct. 23, 1876. H.M.'s Consul."

Mr. Gladstone, in his article on the Hellenic Factor on the Eastern Problem, says :—"Probably for the first time during two thousand years, the silence of the Pnyx at Athens was broken a few weeks ago by the stir of an assembly comprising, as we are told, about ten thousand persons.* The meeting was first addressed by the Professor of History in the University at Athens, who advanced this among his claims to speak on the occasion—that he had seen his brother and his brother-in-law beheaded, and his father and his uncle hung.

"The first stage of the descent of the Greeks was when they came under the Roman dominion. But *Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit.* This first reverse was mitigated by the majesty of the Power to which they succumbed, and by a continuous intellectual reign; such that, when Christianity went forth into the world, no sooner had it moved outwards from its cradle in Jerusalem, than it assumed the aspect of a Greek religion. That aspect it bore for centuries. In the Greek tongue, and by minds in which the Greek element predominated, was moulded that creed which still remains the intellectual basis of the Christian system. In the second century, it was still the ruling Christian tongue in Rome, where Pope Victor was the first who wrote in Latin on the business of the Church.† But even political jealousy was not so keen and sharp-eyed an enemy to Greek independence as ecclesiastical ambition. Of this we have the most extraordinary proof in the letter addressed by Pope Pius II. to Mahomet II. shortly after the capture of Constantinople. The Pontiff exhorts the victorious Sultan (1461) to embrace Christianity, and not only promises, upon that condition, to confer on him, by virtue of his own apostolical authority, the legitimate sovereignty of all the countries he had conquered from the Greeks, but engages to use him for the re-establishment over those countries of the supremacy of the Papal Chair. '*Tuum brachium,*' he says, '*in eos imploraremus, qui jura Ecclesiæ Romanæ*

* Compte Rendu de l'Assemblée, &c. Athènes, 1876.

† Döllinger, "Hippolytus und Kallistus," chap. i. p. 28. Plummer's Translation, p. 25.

*nonnunquam usurpant, et contra matrem suam cornua erigunt.'** Such was the consolation administered, on the Christian side and from the highest quarter, to those crushed under the calamity of Ottoman domination. It was their peculiar fate to be smitten on one cheek because they were Christians, and on the other because they were not Latin Christians. Had it not been, says Dr. Pichler, the learned historian of the Schism, for the religious division of East and West, the Turks never could have established their dominion in Europe.†

"Before Mr. Canning took office in 1822, the British Government viewed the Greek rebellion with an evil eye, from jealousy of Russia. According to Finlay,‡ its aversion was greater than that of "any other Christian Government." Its nearest representative, Sir Thomas Maitland, well known in the Ionian Islands as King Tom, after breaking faith with the people there by the establishment of a government virtually absolute in his own hands, endeavoured (but in vain) to detect by the low use of espionage the plans, yet in embryo, of the revolution.

"But to the Emperor Nicholas and to his country, aided by the good offices of Prussia, redounded the final honour of including in the Russian Treaty of Peace the provisions of July 1827. The tenth article of the Treaty of Adrianople is the international charter of the independent existence of Greece.§ Though the Sultan had vaguely agreed to the concession before the Treaty, at the instance of England and France, yet his willingness to comply may be set down, in the main, to the formidable nearness of the Russian army.

"Brigandage had long since been occasional and limited, at the

* Pichler, i. 501. † Ibid. i. 498.

‡ Greek Revolution, ii. 161; Gordon i. 315. Also compare Tricoupi, Hellenikè Epanastasis, i. 339, seqq.; ii. 219; iii. 267. On the change in the English policy, and its effect, see Tricoupi, 191—194. The majority of Mr. Canning's Cabinet did not sympathize with him; but he had the advantage of a thoroughly loyal chief in Lord Liverpool.

§ Finlay, Greek Revolution, ii. 222; La Russie et la Turquie, pp. 102—113.

time when England was shocked and harrowed by a deplorable but single outrage, of a kind from which Italy has been but lately purged, and Sicily, we must fear, is not yet purged altogether. The venality, unblushing and almost universal, among public men at Constantinople, hides its head in Athens, much as it did in England under Sir Robert Walpole. Recently detected in the gross transactions between certain ministers and certain bishops, it was brought to trial, and severely punished by the regular unbiassed action of the Courts. In this small and almost municipal State, the independence of the Judiciary appears to be placed beyond question; of itself an inestimable advantage. The higher clergy live in harmony with the State, the lower with the people; and the correspondence of our Foreign Office would show instances of their liberal feeling, such as are likely to exercise a beneficial influence upon Eastern Christendom at large. Their union with the people at large makes them an important element of strength to the social fabric. It was indeed an union cemented by suffering. On Easter Day, in April 1821, the Patriarch Gregorios* was arrested in his robes, after divine service, and hanged at the gate of his own palace in Constantinople. After three days he was cut down, and his body delivered to a rabble of low Jews, who dragged it through the streets, and threw it into the sea. Gordon enumerates about twenty Bishops, who were massacred or executed by the Turks in the early stages of the Revolution.† As for the priests, they suffered everywhere, and first of all.‡

"The statistical record, moreover, of the progress of Greece, drawn from public sources, is far from being wholly unsatisfactory.

"The population, which stood in 1834 at 650,000, had risen in 1870 to 1,238,000; that is to say, it had nearly doubled in thirty-six years; a more rapid rate of increase than that of Great

* Gordon, i. 187. Finlay, i. 230. Tricoupi, Hellenikè Epanastasis, vol. i. pp. 102—107, chap. vi.

† Gordon, i. 187, 188, 190, 194, 306.

‡ Ibid. i. 192.

Britain, and far beyond the ordinary European rate. With the Ionian Islands, Greece must now contain a number of souls considerably beyond a million and a half.

"In 1830, Greece had 110 schools, with 9,249 scholars. In 1860, it had 752 schools, with 52,860 scholars. The University of Athens, which in 1837 had 52 students, in 1866 could show 1,182.

"The revenue, which was £275,000 in 1833, was £518,000 in 1845, and £1,283,000 in 1873; or probably about a million, after allowing for the Ionian Islands.

"For the shipping and trade of Greece, the figures, though imperfect, are not unsatisfactory. The number of Greek seamen, augmented by the addition of the Ionian Islands, was in 1871 no less than 35,000. But before that annexation they were 24,000; or almost three times as many, in proportion to population, as those of the United Kingdom. The tonnage is over 400,000 for 1871. Before the union with the Ionian Islands, the imports and exports averaged for 1853-7, £1,546,000; but for 1858-62 £2,885,000. For 1867-71 they had risen to £4,662,000. That portion of Greek trade which is carried on with the United Kingdom, and which was in 1861 £923,000, had risen in 1871 to £2,332,000.

"Mr. Finlay speaks of the strong leaning of the Ionian population to Russia. This may have been true, and with very good reason for it, in the time of Sir Thomas Maitland; or in the Island which, according to Gordon,* "groaned for years under the iron rod of a wretch, whose odious tyranny would have disgraced a Turkish Pasha." Of that people who still fondle in their memories the names of Canning and of Byron, there are in the Levant, we may safely say, four millions on whose affections we may take a standing hold, by giving a little friendly care at this juncture to the case of the Hellenic provinces.

"An Athenian" says, as to the schism between the Greek and Bulgarian Churches:—"The whole of Servia and the Northern

* Vol. i. p. 318.

Provinces had always a clergy of their own, and a large proportion of both the priests and bishops of Bulgaria were natives educated in the seminary of Chalki. If the proportion was not greater it was owing to the natural inaptitude and disinclination of the Bulgarians for intellectual occupations. This is so positive that even the present Bulgarian Exarch Anthimos, of Widin, the prelate whom they choose to hold first that post of national trust, is a Greek by birth and education, and was, until his defection, one of the Constantinopolitan Synod. The same was the case with Panaretos, the Bulgarian Bishop of Philippopolis, and with most of their ablest priests and bishops who are now the mainstay of the Exarchate. It so happens, however, that the Exarch is now elected in the same manner as the Patriarch, the Porte having in each case the casting vote, and the Bulgarian Bishops are nominated by precisely the same process as the Greek prelates.

"Still, what difficulties had these men to contend with in a State where, far from receiving any remuneration for their ministry, they had, like every other Giaour, to purchase the very privilege of life! The ministers of the Church had to pay for their posts—as every other office is paid for in Turkey—to the Governors, and they had, consequently, to recoup themselves as best they could. But how has it fared with the new Exarchate? Why, it has hardly been in existence for four years as a brand new national establishment, and already two Bishops have been expelled from their sees by their own Bulgarian flocks for unmerciful fleecing.

"The Greeks, notwithstanding systematic and barbarous persecution, had, with characteristic ability and perseverance, secured the control of all the trade of the Black Sea, and of the mouths of the Danube, and the sole object in life of most of those devoted men was, by stinting themselves of the commonest necessities, to amass a fortune, which they bequeathed for the establishment of schools, hospitals, and orphanages, and for the publication of books propagating useful knowledge among their countrymen. Those savings were almost universally invested in landed estates

in the Danubian Principalities, then under Greek Hospodars, and in Bessarabia, equally safe from Turkish depredations, and the deeds of ownership were made over to one of three great national institutions, namely, the Patriarchate, of Constantinople, the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and the Brotherhood of the Monks of Mount Athos. Thus, in the course of time, immense sums of money accumulated in the hands of the Greek clergy, who, whatever their shortcomings, made so effectual a use of their trust that the revival of Greek learning and the consequent awakening of the people are clearly traceable to that agency. Prince Couza of Roumania was prevailed upon to sequestrate by one stroke of the pen the whole of the Danubian estates, which, yielding several millions of yearly income, were not the property of the Church of the Principalities, but the bequest of aliens to alien institutions. A more glaring case of unscrupulous spoilation has never been recorded.

"The Patriarchate soon discovered these tactics, and obviously deriving no advantage from the allegiance of a people given over to agitation, offered to recognize a separate head, not of a Bulgarian Orthodox Church, but of an Orthodox Church in Bulgaria, and to concede to it the same privileges of administering its internal affairs which the Synods of Greece and Servia already enjoy, provided the Bulgarian Committee fixed territorial limits to this new organization.

"Aali Pasha issued a firman in 1870, by virtue of which a separate Bulgarian Exarchate was established, having power to appoint a Bulgarian Bishop in whatever locality a part of the population, however insignificant, was pronounced to be Bulgarian.

"The manner in which this firman worked is as follows: 'In most of the towns and villages on the tract of land between Bulgaria proper, Thrace, and Macedonia, the population is unfortunately mixed. The Greek schools, hospitals, and churches, supported out of the Danubian Estates Income, were rapidly being closed for want of funds. But the Bulgarian agitators, feeling themselves well backed and encouraged, took by actual assault school-houses and churches which had been erected with Greek funds, and had always been recognized as Greek institutions.'

"In these circumstances, it was impossible for the Greek Patriarchate to allow this movement to extend unchecked. A Synod of all the Oriental Churches was convened at Constantinople, and on the Exarch refusing to lay down territorial limits to his jurisdiction, a schism between the Greek and the Bulgarian Churches was proclaimed in October, 1872."

"An Athenian" also says, as to Greek brigandage:—"It may be asked, What right has Greece to question at all the measures adopted by a neighbouring State with regard to its territory? The right of the Greek Government is a three-fold one—it refers to the security of its frontiers, to the existing international relations, and to the inalienable and irrefragable bonds which unite all the members of the Greek nation together. It appears to me unnecessary to dilate upon the nature and mode of existence of the Circassians stationed in colonies near the frontier. When they do not actually burn and butcher, as they have lately done in Bulgaria, they subsist by child-stealing, cattle-lifting, and systematic brigandage. They have no trade except depredation, and no acknowledged pursuit except the commerce of human flesh, beginning with their own children. They accept no fixed locality as their abode, and a 'settlement' with them simply means a provisional centre of operations, which they shift as soon as the country around has ceased to afford any attraction in the way of available plunder. Consequently, even a distant approach of these marauders is a continual source of danger and apprehension.

"I am at a loss to offer a precedent adequately illustrative of the present case, for the simple reason that no European Government ever attempted so flagrant a breach of all international obligations and so shameless a disregard of the dictates of decency. To say nothing of the premiums offered by civilized Governments for the destruction of locusts and for the strict circumscription of the cattle plague—and these are less severe visitations than an incursion of Circassians—I must remind English readers that the people of Hampstead protested against the establishment of a fever hospital in their vicinity, and

that your Australian colonists refused to receive convicts and ticket-of-leave men, all of whom are under proper restraint and quite harmless as compared with Circassians. I will also add that Prince Bismarck's protest against the employment of the savage Turcos by France against Germany was accepted in England as a just condemnation of an inadmissible mode of carrying on civilized warfare.

"Greece is not at war with Turkey—the relations between the two countries had never been so friendly as of late—the more reason why Greece should expect to be treated in perfect loyalty and unreserved confidence. We have been bitterly reproached with the existence of brigandage on the Greco-Turkish border. We protested that the evil was fomented in Turkey and thence let loose upon us; that it was impossible to adequately guard our frontiers—such as the Protecting Powers, in their wisdom, had decided to mark out—against daily incursions, and that Greece was as little responsible for these periodical irruptions of brigandage from the other sides as Canada has ever been deemed for the Fenian raids. So long as Turkey made it a practice to line the frontiers with irregular Albanians and Bashi-Bazouks, who were only an organized and officially recognized body of brigands, and who allowed bands to cross over into Greece on the understanding that the spoil was to be divided on their return, it was impossible to answer even for the safety of Attica itself, which is only a day's march from the frontier. Thanks to the intervention of the British Ambassador at Constantinople, the Porte was at last prevailed upon to substitute in 1874 regular troops at the frontier, and at Sir Henry Elliott's* suggestion General Ali Pasha, a renegade Pole, but an honest man and an able officer, was placed in command in Thessaly. Brigandage had since then disappeared, and it was only on the removal of Ali Pasha to the seat of war and the return of irregulars to Thessaly that trouble again began, thus proving to demonstration, on the one hand, the injustice of

* Poor Sir Henry (Elliott) is a good worthy sort of upper clerk. He is snubbed now by every one.

imputing to Greece the evil of brigandage, and on the other, the complete control which Turkey has always possessed over our own internal security."

In an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, M. Leroy-Beaulieu says: "The Greece of 1830 is by its configuration even deprived of internal equilibrium. Composed exclusively of the Hellenic provinces of the South, it is quite southern by the character of its inhabitants as well as by latitude, and wants the counterpoise which the provinces of the North Epirus and Thessaly would have given it. Existing Greece is like a France confined to Provençals and Gascons, the most lively perhaps, the best speakers the most intelligent even of all the French; but assuredly, neither the wisest nor the quietest.

"The Greece of 1830 resembles also an Italy reduced to Naples and Sicily, all meridional, all maritime. The heavy Bœotians and the wild Etolians do not suffice to give to the kingdom the interior balance which it wants, it would have required the steadfast populations of Thessaly and Epirus. As the alloy of a grosser metal gives to gold or silver more strength, the heavier blood of the Albanians would have happily corrected in the northern provinces Greek ductility. Within the actual limits of Greece on a restricted and impoverished soil with such a predominance of the element which is naturally the most turbulent of them, the circumstance as to which one must be astonished is not the faults of the Greeks as to their revolutions, their bankruptcies, it is their wisdom, their relative prosperity, their progress. Though the Greeks of the kingdom may, perhaps, have often been inferior to their brethren outside, they have performed the miracle of living in conditions where existence seemed impossible, and of preserving liberty under conditions where absolutism seemed their only chance of safety. . . . Primary instruction is more general among the Greeks than among many western nations—than, for instance, in England and Belgium. . . . The principal article of commerce of Greece with the foreigner is currants. The produce of the kingdom is thus at the caprice of the English plum pudding

and cookery. . . . The Greek fleet is equal to that of Russia, of which the European territory is a hundred times larger than that of Greece, and very much greater than that of the Ottoman Empire, of which most of the vessels are manned by Greeks. . . In contesting with each other the possession of Thrace and Macedonia, in presence of their common master, Greeks and Slavs seem, according to the popular expresssion, to fight for the skin of the bear before they have killed it. . . It is the ethnological map of Kiepert, which has served, they say, as a basis for the studies of the Conference. The Bulgarians accept usually the results of these labours, the Greeks reject them. I ought to say that a professor of the Lyceum of Galita Serai, M. A. Synvet, has just presented, with the aid of information supplied him by the Patriarchate of Constantinople, facts in a more favourable light for the Greek claims. . . .

"In the dioceses (Eparchies) of which they took possession, the Bulgarians, yesterday under the yoke of the Phanarcotes, have sometimes used their power to oppress in their turn their former masters, shutting the Greek churches and schools, and desiring to impose the use of Slavonian on those whom they reproached with having wished to compel them to speak Greek. The two rival nationalities, led away by the ambitious views, for the future seem thus to have given themselves the mission to maintain themselves reciprocally in servitude. 'To divide to reign' is a maxim of which the practice is so much the more easy to the Mussulman master, since the Christian subjects take upon themselves to apply it for them. The Greeks and the Slavs, who have so often revolted against the Turks, take care usually not to do so at the same time; they wait to rise until the Porte has done with their rivals. If the territory to which the Greeks may aspire to possess themselves is limited, the Greek mind will always possess a much vaster field. Their dispersion over two or three continents only neutralizes the grandeur and the political strength of the Greeks, by increasing their moral influence. Thanks to it, the language of Athens will extend far beyond the land of the kingdom, and Hellenism will remain grander and more powerful than Greece."

Mr. Holms, M.P., says that Athens, which had in 1830 only 7,000 inhabitants, now has 50,000; and the revenue of Greece, which was £612,600 in 1833, is now £1,416,000. The mercantile marine of Greece, which nearly perished at the end of the War of Independence, and in 1835 numbered but 3,370 vessels, of 90,000 tons, at the end of 1872 reached 6,142 vessels, of 420,210 tons, and with 35,000 sailors. At Constantinople and Leghorn the Greek flag ranks second only to the English; at Marseilles only to that of France; and a large portion of the trade of the Black Sea and eastern parts of the Mediterranean is carried on under the Greek flag.

The number of Greek houses in London is 120, in Liverpool 30, and in Manchester 64; and in London there is a Greek bank and a Greek school, as well as a Greek insurance establishment. Where do we see a Turkish house of business? They are unknown in any commercial town in Europe.

I may add that, as in the case of Themistocles, who every one allowed to be at least second in valour at the battle of Salamis, and whom all then recognised as first, so the Greeks must be admitted by the universal suffrage of Europe to have done more for civilization than any race which ever existed.

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

My self-imposed task is now ended, but I cannot but look ruefully on the vast mass of valuable materials which I have been reluctantly obliged to sacrifice in a species of Massacre of the Innocents, in order to retain my work within reasonable limits.

My wish and intention has been to write a book which should enable an ordinary Englishman, who had previously known nothing whatever respecting the Eastern Question, to acquire a complete acquaintance with the whole subject, in all its details and with its various side issues, at a single sitting, and that it should be published at a sufficiently low price to place it within the reach of all classes.

No one can be more fully aware than I am of the very numerous faults and imperfections of my work, but I trust that the friends of the Christian cause, at least, will accept my abundant good will for my inadequate performance.

As to those who are hostile to the Christians and to Russia, and who are favourable to Turkey, as I have given them no quarter, I expect none myself, and am ready to maintain my ground against all comers. As Mr. Gladstone has been chastised with rods, I must expect to be chastised with scorpions, since, though heartily in favour of the Christians, he is but a lukewarm supporter of Russia, whilst I support that great country out and out. I must say, I think the attacks made on Mr. Gladstone for the course he has pursued on this question are palpably unjust to him and most discreditable to their authors.

To begin with the pawns on the Government side of the poli-

tical chessboard, I will quote as a specimen of most culpable detraction the following passage from an address which was delivered by Mr. Ashbury, M.P. for Brighton, to his constituents in January last:—

"It must not be forgotten that he (Mr. Gladstone) has written a series of pamphlets by which he has put into his pocket about ten thousand English sovereigns. Why has he not shown his sympathy by sending blankets to that amount? As far as I am concerned, I can scarcely conceive a more discreditable transaction; an honourable gentleman taking advantage of his former position of Prime Minister, as leader of the Liberal party, and, as he hoped, future leader of the Government—but which I hope he will never be—*to take advantage of his prestige and trade on suffering humanity in order to put money in his pocket.*"

Such venomous and unjust attacks must give annoyance even to so eminent a man as Mr. Gladstone, while praise from this and similar quarters could not afford the smallest satisfaction, and if I am asked to explain this apparent inconsistency, I answer in the words of Byron, that "the kick of an ass can give pain to one to whom its most exquisite braying can give no pleasure."

Now, as Mr. Gladstone, in the course of his long and honourable career, has repeatedly resigned office on grounds which even his opponents often showed thought over-punctiliousness, and when he could have retained his position with perfect credit—as he a few years ago dissolved Parliament and risked his tenure of power when he had a majority of nearly a hundred in his favour —he of all public men is the one who is least open to such a charge. As I have mentioned Mr. Ashbury, I will point out one or two amongst many of the egregious errors into which he fell in the address in question, which was greedily swallowed by his dull and credulous listeners. He said, "The number of Mahometans in that particular portion of Turkey is 3,230,000 against 4,270 Christians." But the fact is, as appears by the Almanac de Gotha, the Christians, whom he estimates at 4,270, number 4,792,443, so that his estimate is less than one-thousandth of their actual numbers, a degree of inaccuracy which may rank

with Dr. Kenealy's estimate that the English have massacred four thousand millions of people.

He subsequently says that fifteen to twenty thousand Russians joined the Servian army, whilst Mr. Mackenzie Wallace says the real numbers were four thousand; so that, whilst geese dwindled to goslings in the matter of (the Christian) population in Mr. Ashbury's hands, they became swans in the case of the Russian volunteers.

Another mis-statement is, that the Turkish fleet was destroyed at Sinope in 1854, whilst that event really happened in 1353, and it is utterly untrue as stated by Mr. Ashbury that the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Sinope took place before a declaration of war, for war was declared by Turkey against Russia on the 5th October, 1853, and by Russia against Turkey on the 1st November, 1853, whilst the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Sinope took place on the 30th November, 1853. The lecturer proceeded to say, "It was currently reported and believed that he (the Sultan) had invited General Ignatieff to garrison Constantinople with Russian troops." If this is true, it is no more than took place in 1833, when the Russians alone saved Constantinople from being captured by Ibrahim Pasha, and it shows that the Russians are not so ambitious as Mr. Ashbury and his friends pretend, since, if General Ignatieff had taken advantage of this invitation, it would have been impossible to have prevented another Russian occupation of Constantinople.

We are then told that Lord Palmerston said of Mr. Gladstone, "Gladstone will either ruin his country or die in the madhouse;" but, having asked some of those best acquainted with Lord Palmerston, they positively assure me that he was incapable of using such an expression towards one of our greatest statesmen, for whom he had the utmost respect and regard, and whose colleague he had been.

We are afterwards told that in the twelve months previous to the dissolution of 1874, "Government supporters *at every election*" were defeated, which is totally untrue.

Next comes the amazing statement "that our imports and exports are two hundred times greater than those of Russia." Now,

the "Statesman's Year Book" gives the total value of the Russian imports at £60,000,000 sterling, and the exports at £52,000,000, or together £112,000,000; and two hundred times that amount, according to Mr. Ashbury's statement, would be the prodigious sum of £22,400,000,000, whilst the total exports and imports of the United Kingdom in 1875 were £655,551,900, or less than one thirty-fourth part of Mr. Ashbury's estimate. This is the way in which members of "the stupid party" justify their appellation, and enlighten their constituents with wildly inaccurate facts and obsolete and erroneous theories.

I now come to the Attorney-General, who was once a candidate for the Reform Club, who attempted to harpoon our Liberal whale, and did not hesitate to say in a speech to his constituents that Mr. Gladstone "had entered into a warfare against the Government, animated by a vindictive malignity founded on his exclusion from office;" and surely this, as Mr. Gladstone pointed out, is most improper and unjustifiable language from one who probably will occupy one day the highest judicial position.

The most outrageous of the attacks on Mr. Gladstone, however, proceeded from Lord Beaconsfield, who thus endeavoured to tomahawk and scalp him at Aylesbury: "It would be affectation in me to pretend that the Government is backed by the country. The opinion of a large party in this country would, if carried out, be injurious to the interests of England and fatal to peace. . . . . The danger at such a moment is this, that designing politicians may take advantage of such sublime sentiments and may apply them for their sinister ends. . . Such conduct outrages the principles of patriotism; it injures the common welfare of humanity *in the general havoc and crime it may accomplish, and may be fairly described as worse than any of those Bulgarian atrocities* of which we have heard so much." Everyone knows that this Parthian arrow was meant for Mr. Gladstone, and a more odious, unjust, and disgraceful charge was never brought by one politician against another, especially behind his back, when he had no opportunity of replying; for why did not Lord Beaconsfield give him notice of his intended attack?

and I will be bound he would have rushed to repel it from the furthest corner of the country. Lord Beaconsfield pays Aylesbury the doubtful compliment of periodically exhibiting there his celebrated decoys, which are generally but rather lame specimens of those ducks for which Aylesbury is famous, and if they swallow all his statements, the town will hereafter be still more celebrated for the abundance of its geese. It suffices to refute Lord Beaconsfield and the other Turcophiles who stated that the agitation initiated by Mr. Gladstone had been injurious and factitious—such as Lord Derby, who described the feeling of the British people last autumn as a got-up sentiment, and expressed his opinion that the effect of it had been mischievous—to quote the following sentence from one of his own colleagues (Lord Carnarvon): "He did not disagree, if he rightly understood it, with the public feeling and opinion. . . He thought, on the contrary, it was a credit to the country. He rejoiced that there was neither delay nor hesitation in the expression of that feeling, and so far from weakening the hands of the Government, he believed that if rightly understood at home and abroad, nothing would more strengthen the hands of his noble friend, the Foreign Secretary, than the burst of indignation which had just gone through the length and breadth of the land."

When I consider the foregoing envenomed attack of the Turcophiles on such a man as Mr. Gladstone, after his almost unparalleled services, and that all who favour Russia are treated as political Ishmaels and social Pariahs, I ought, I suppose, to feel greater alarm than I really do at the fate which may be in store for me who have given so much greater cause of offence, especially as I have not only upheld the cause of the Christians of Turkey, but also that of their heroic Russian liberators.

As I have arranged with an official of high position that this work will reach the Emperor of Russia, and as it is to be published in the Russian language, I venture to take this opportunity of earnestly and respectfully urging on him the expediency, as well as the justice, of immediately renewing the promise made by the Emperor Alexander I. of granting a

liberal constitution to the whole Russian Empire, to take effect as soon as the national war of liberation of the Christians of Turkey is satisfactorily concluded.

Almost the only friends and well-wishers of the Russian Empire in England belong to the Liberal party, and they are hampered and discouraged in their advocacy of the sacred cause of the Christians of Turkey by the unfortunate circumstance that Russia has not a constitution.

The overwhelming majority of Englishmen make a species of idol of parliamentary government, and absurdly consider it a panacea for all political and social evils. In fact, just as Cicero too broadly said, "Iniquissimam pacem justissimo bello antefero," so the typical Briton would be apt to prefer the Irish Parliament, the Rump Parliament of Cromwell, the subservient and state-nominated chambers of Napoleon III., or even the Turkish Assembly, with all its absurdity, injustice, stupidity, and folly, to the rule of an Antoninus, an Alfred the Great, or an Alexander II. of Russia.

I think it was Montesquieu who said that the people of England are free only during the time of the elections, which need not take place more than once in seven years, and during the whole interval, as at present, we are at the beck and call of a single man (Lord Beaconsfield), who will not take the sense of the people, though he has publicly avowed that they do not approve of his policy. After all, there are only about two millions of voters out of a population of thirty millions, so that only one fifteenth have the franchise; and the seats are so absurdly distributed, that the balance of power is in favour of the minority of the electors, who possess the majority of seats, and the whole agricultural population are as much disfranchised as if they were serfs. They are good enough to die for their country, but not to vote; whilst the Rayahs of Turkey, if they have no power at least do not serve in the army.

It is quite obvious that in the Southern States of the American Republic the existence of Parliamentary Institutions was an absolute bar to the emancipation of the great majority of the

population, who were slaves, treated with the utmost barbarity and injustice, and demoralized and degraded even the mean whites, who were the most numerous portion by far of the white population, and who were the instruments of the tyranny of the planters; and an English seaman once seeing some mean white driving a number of negro men and women to the market for sale with knotted whips, was heard to remark, "If the devil don't seize them 'ere fellows, we might as well not have no devil."

If there had been a benevolent and intelligent absolute Government in the Southern States, the negroes would probably have been emancipated a generation sooner—when we emancipated our negroes in the West Indies—and a bloody war, with a colossal debt far exceeding the total value of the negroes, would have been avoided. On the other hand, benevolent and intelligent absolute sovereigns are rare, and experience shows that in the long run parliamentary government is by far the best for any civilized and Christian country.

It was impossible that Russia could have had an efficient parliamentary government as long as serfdom existed, and England probably retarded by several years the emancipation of the serfs, by the Crimean War; but now that they have been freed for sixteen years, and have for ten years worked the local institutions which the Czar has given them quite as well, according to Mr. Mackenzie Wallace, as the people of any other country in Europe, it is clear that they are now perfectly fitted to receive a liberal constitution.

Middle-aged men recollect when Austria and other countries were as absolute governments as Russia; but Englishmen never had a bad word for Austria, all the vials of their wrath being reserved, since Lord Palmerston's reign, for Russia, which could never apparently do right; whilst Austria, even in suppressing the Gallician revolt, and inciting the peasants to massacre the nobles, could never do wrong. The Emperor of Russia could, if he thought proper, at first proceed tentatively, say by allowing each Mir or Commune to elect an elector, and all the electors in

each province could elect a member to the Russian House of Commons. The provincial assemblies might again elect Senators, and under such a system there would be no fear but that the Parliament would be only too Conservative.

From Mr. Wallace's account, the Emperor Alexander is evidently not a man of inordinate ambition, with an overweening and jealous attachment to absolute authority, and it would not be to him an enormous sacrifice to become a constitutional sovereign, reigning but not governing, as he already is in Finland, and as Alexander I. and Nicholas were in Poland; whilst surely the Russians in 1877 are more fit for parliamentary government than the Poles were in 1815.

Now that even the Turks have the pretence of a constitution, surely the Russians should have the reality, and they would then rally round their great country the cordial sympathies of the Liberal party in Europe. If the serfs had been emancipated in 1850, and if three years later and before the Crimean War Russia had obtained a free constitution, the Crimean War would probably never have taken place. Russia would have been saved an exhausting expenditure of blood and treasure, and the Liberal party throughout the world, which is everywhere the strongest and most intelligent, would have then willingly concurred in all the territorial arrangements which I have sketched as the probable result of the present war. After all, the position of a constitutional sovereign is not incompatible with very considerable influence, and as much power as would content any reasonable individual. Louis Philippe had even a preponderating influence in the government of France, though a constitutional monarch, and Leopold, the King of the Belgians, who was offered several kingdoms, was second to no sovereign in Europe for the reputation and influence he enjoyed, which extended far beyond the limits of the small kingdom he governed.

The Russians, too, are about the most loyal nation in the world, and the great difficulty I see in Russian parliamentary government is that there would hardly be any opposition.

A critic might here remark that it is very easy to be liberal at

the expense of others; and to propose to a Russian Czar to part with absolute power; but the Emperor of Austria has done the very same thing, to his great honour and enormous advantage, and, to compare great things with trifles, in my own very obscure sphere I have had the satisfaction of doing something which, however comparatively utterly insignificant, was still in the same direction. It happened that I possessed the old feudal privilege of nominating the magistrates for the small town which adjoins my castle, and I could have made a chimney sweep chief magistrate and a justice of the peace besides, and a servant and a street beggar second and third bailies, as they are called. I, however, considered this a most improper and unjust privilege for me to possess, and one which was quite contrary to the spirit of the age; so I, in my small way, gave a constitution to the little town, and am not even a constitutional but an abdicated sovereign. So far, however, from having lost influence in the town by doing an act which saved me from an obnoxious and distasteful responsibility, I have been twice, unexpectedly to myself, returned as member for my county, chiefly, as I believe, because I had divested myself of a power which I was not morally justified in retaining.

Voltaire tells us that Russia had made more progress in fifty years than any other nation in Europe in five hundred years, which is the strongest possible proof that in his opinion her institutions then suited her; but now that education is general in Russia, and that a national spirit, which finds its expression in the enthusiastic words, "Matuscka Roosyia" (Mother Russia), has been aroused of sympathy with fellow Slavonians, constitutional liberty is imperatively and immediately necessary, and literature, art, science, commerce, every interest, would progress with renewed vigour, so that Russia would advance, not by an arithmetical, but by a geometrical progression.

For those whose intellectual calibre does not permit to them read anything drier than works of fiction, and who can only swallow the pill of knowledge when profusely silverised, and for those who, having been beguiled into reading my facts, arguments,

and statistics, and who, after such a dose of senna or castor oil, require a *bonne bouche*, I have provided that requisite in the shape of an amusing satirical sketch by Thackeray of life in a Mahometan country, and a genial and humorous account of an interview between a Turkish Pasha and a typical West Indian, by the graphic pen of Kinglake.

Voltaire apologised on one occasion to a lady for writing a long letter to her because he had not time to write a short one, but I have endeavoured to economise my readers' time by an elaborate and arduous condensation of facts and arguments at the expense of my own.

I confess, to use a stereotyped parliamentary phrase, I am greatly alarmed by the presentiment that Lord Beaconsfield will endeavour to take advantage of the parliamentary recess, early next month, to involve us in a war with Russia in favour of Turkey, by which we should incur the guilt of subjecting the Christians to the intolerable yoke of their Ottoman oppressors.

It is well-known that the early works of Lord Beaconsfield, or rather of Mr. Disraeli, are of a somewhat prophetic character. In his "Tancred," published about thirty years ago, we find the title of Empress of India, and also that of the Earl of Beaconsfield. In the same work there are some remarks which are not inapplicable to the present state of the Eastern Question, and to the opinions of a most eminent statesman. Keferinis, the celebrated Prime Minister of the Queen of Ansorey, a great master of the art of "amplification of phraseology," thus expresses himself: "It is not to be denied, or in any way concealed, that a Turk, especially if he be a Pasha, is, of all obscene and utter children of the devil, the most entirely contemptible and thoroughly to be execrated."

The chief hope of those who warmly espouse the Christian cause is that Lord Salisbury, who has shown so much ability and resolution hitherto in opposing the pro-Turkish party in the Cabinet, will remain firm, and if he and the others who follow him leave the Government if a warlike policy is persisted in, Lord Beaconsfield would either have to resign or dissolve Parliament.

It is a monstrous injustice and anachronism that on the fictitious pretence that a declaration of war is a prerogative of the Crown, the whole lives and properties of every Englishman, and even our national existence, are at the mercy of a single man, alien in race, feeling, and character to our country, whilst in the United States there is a committee of foreign relations of the Senate, without whose concurrence not even the most insignificant treaty can be ratified; and this body rejected the Johnson Treaty, negotiated by Lord Derby, so that by our absurd system the Americans can bind us, whilst they are themselves free.

The present Parliament was elected, and a Conservative majority unexpectedly returned, chiefly by the influence of the Licensed Victuallers, whom Lord Aberdare had irreconcilably offended; and surely three years later we are entitled to have an appeal to the nation on the gigantic issue of peace or war, with effete Turkey only as an ally, against our old and powerful ally Russia.

There are plenty of men on the Liberal side of the House of Commons who, if any attempt is made by Government to get additional supplies of men or money by hook or by crook, will divide the house any number of times that may be necessary to defeat them, if we remained till this time twelve months, or until the war is ended; and I would fain hope that Her Majesty sympathises with the atrocious wrongs of the Christians, and that if Lord Beaconsfield (who, as I have elsewhere shown, is stated by Count Seebach to have treated with the enemy in the Crimean War, and who has himself admitted that the Government is not backed by the country) endeavoured to persuade the Queen to sign a declaration of war against Russia, she would dismiss him instantly from office, send for Mr. Gladstone, and appeal to the country.

Mr. Gladstone, in a letter to the Baptists of Worcestershire, says, "The Government have already, in 1877, asked from Parliament for military and naval purposes £24,700,000. In 1870 we had asked £20,500,000, adding to this sum the £2,000,000 we asked after the Franco-German War began; we had

£22,500,000 or less by £2,500,000 than the charge for this year already placed on the estimates. Our proposal was not made upon the outbreak of the war, nor upon any alleged necessity for defending British interests, but after the disclosures of what was known as the Benedetti draft of a treaty for the absorption of Belgium (by France)."

I recollect hearing a story of a sovereign of England who wanted a coachman, and on four candidates appearing he asked the first, "If you were driving me near a precipice how near would you approach it?" The first candidate, to show his skill, said, "Your Majesty, I would go within a foot of it." The second, not to be beaten, said he would go within an inch of it, while the third, to trump them both, said he would put one wheel over. The last, however, said he would keep as far from it as possible. "Then you are my man," said the king; and I trust that Her Majesty will see that Mr. Gladstone is the safe State coachman, who will remain as far as possible from the precipice of war with Russia, whilst the driver of the Derby dilly, the inscrutable author of the Asian mystery, is like the reckless Jehu who is almost certain to upset the national coach.

The course which the Ministry are pursuing, in sometimes attacking Russia on the score of British interests, and at other times on that of the independence of Turkey, according as it suits their purpose, reminds me of a cartoon in *Punch*, which I shall take the liberty of adapting to their case: A countryman at a fair is looking at an allegorical picture in two compartments, one representing British interests, the other Turkish independence—both rather hazy and indistinct. And after puzzling over them for a long time, he at last asks, "Which is Turkish independence, and which is British interests?" Upon which the showman answers, "Whichever you please, my man; you pay your money and you takes your choice." And so, provided we only join in hostility to the Turks, it does not signify a straw to the Government whether it is for Turkish independence or British interests. "Any stone is good enough to throw at a dog."

I confess I regard with the greatest grief and the most profound humiliation the utterly selfish and extremely discreditable policy which England has adopted on the Eastern Question, and which may be dated from the abandonment of Parga to Turkey at the peace of 1815, for previously to that time we had been uniformly hostile to the savage despotism of the Turks.

I have already pointed out at considerable length the disgrace which we brought on our national credit by our conduct with reference to Parga, and our heartless indifference for so many years to the noble and glorious struggle of the Greeks for freedom and independence; and though I might refer to many events in the interval which reflect discredit upon us, I will now proceed to touch on the attitude of England at the period when the Crimean war broke out—where Kinglake, in his able and instructive work, states, "The English desired war, and perhaps it ought to be acknowledged that there were many to whom war for the sake of war was no longer a hateful thought. . . . England had become so eager for conflict, that the idea of desisting from the war merely because the war had ceased to be necessary was not tolerable to the people. The Crimean war was undertaken really for supposed British interests, but on the pretext of defending the integrity and independence of Turkey; however, the fact is, that British interests as well as British honour lay in exactly the opposite direction, for if Turkey were a Christian and well-governed State, the population would become, as it formerly was, four or five times as great as it now is, and each individual would be on an average so much more wealthy, that our commerce with that country would probably increase tenfold."

The most hostile foreigner could not well bring a heavier charge against England than that which Kinglake here makes. No one with a spark of humanity about him can regard war in any other point of view than as a hideous, but, alas! sometimes necessary evil; and in the Book which, of all others, we profess to reverence, we are told that God "will scatter the people that delight in war."

On the occasion of the atrocious massacres which have led to

the present war, Sir H. Elliott, our ambassador in Turkey, disgraced himself and his country by the following astounding and unprecedentedly cynical sentence in a dispatch:—"The necessity which exists for England to prevent changes from occurring here which would be most detrimental to ourselves is not affected by the question whether it was 10,000 or 20,000 persons who perished in the suppression . . . and cannot be a sufficient reason for abandoning a policy which is the only one that can be followed with a due regard to our own interests." But if real or supposed British interests are to overrule all other considerations, it follows that if the whole moral and material welfare and happiness of the entire human race, numbering 1,200,000,000 (excepting 30,000,000 of Britons), depended on our pursuing one course of action, and the real or supposed advantage of England was in the other scale, we should deliberately choose the temporal and eternal ruin of the rest of the human race, rather than abate the most infinitesimal portion of the English interests—or, rather, not the interests of the majority of the nation, but those of the aristocrats and plutocrats who form what is called the "Upper Ten Thousand;" and one of the twelve apostles who now constitute the D'Israelitish Cabinet (the same antediluvian politician who in the recent debate had the audacity again to call the glorious victory of Navarino "an untoward event") has shown in an immortal poem that, in his opinion, England should be governed, not for the advantage of the many, but in the interest of the few, in the following well-known lines:—

> "Let arts and commerce, laws and learning die,
> But spare, oh spare our old nobility!"

If writing such trash as this is a passport to the highest offices of the State, foreigners will be apt to say stupid, more stupid, and an old-fashioned Tory as the climax of stupidity. The English people, as a whole, are sound at the core, and are willing to submit to the heaviest sacrifices at the call of honour and of duty, but unfortunately on the Eastern Question their intuitive sense of right has been to some extent obscured and confused by the

utterly false representations of a large portion of the press and the influence of the "West-end" and "Upper Ten."

When the war of Secession in America took place, whilst the "West-end" warmly espoused the cause of slavery, the operatives of Lancashire, who were thereby suffering from all the horrors of want, nobly advocated the cause of freedom; and so in this case, even some real loss to British interests would be cheerfully encountered by them in the sacred cause of the Christians of Turkey. Another instance of the selfish policy of the present Government is thus alluded to by the Duke of Argyll:—"The Austrian Government, when refugees from the Turkish provinces came into its territory, gave them out of mere humanity a small pittance to keep them alive. Now I see that through your agents and your Ambassadors you were urging the Austrian Government to withdraw this miserable pittance. Not only this, they were urging them to send back those people into Turkey at the very time when your own agents were telling you that they would give them no sort of security that they would not be murdered within a month; and, urged by the Austrian Government, which was urged by you, some of those unfortunate people did go back, and were murdered."

If I could think, which I do not, that the mass of my countrymen are as blind and selfish as the "West-end," I for one would change my name, abandon my nationality, and, shaking the dust off my feet, I would leave my country for ever.

The "West-end" now affect to pour out their sympathies for the long by-past grievances of Poland, so as to draw a red herring, as it were, across the national scent which points to the present wrongs of the Christians of Turkey; and they remind me of what Byron said of Sterne—"They prefer whining over a dead ass to relieving a living sufferer."

I have written strongly on this subject because all my feelings are warmly engaged on the side of the Christians of Turkey; and as no one else is both able and willing to do justice to their Russian liberators at the risk of any amount of obloquy, I throw myself, as it were, into the breach.

The cause I have espoused requires and deserves an abler advocate. I have endeavoured to do my best, and lament my inability to do more. What I have performed may probably be deemed no more in proportion to the end to be attained than the ratio between the widow's mite and the total amount of the Jewish treasury, but, as in that case, so in mine—it is all that I am able to offer.

The impressive words of an eloquent writer are singularly applicable to the present position of the Turcophile party in England, which so triumphantly exults in its overwhelming influence and power, and which will not even listen to what is to be said on the other side of this great and vitally important question, but ardently hopes to involve us in war with Russia:—"It is in this midnight of your intoxication that I foresee an awakening of bitterness; it is at this spring-tide of your joy that I warn you that an ebb of troubles is at hand; and if its sound cannot break your slumbers, and if its sense cannot pierce your breasts, its tone will be preserved, and will sink upon your spirits when they are softened by misfortune."

I conclude by entreating the masses of my countrymen who are urged by the Turcomaniacs to prefer supposed British interests to justice to bear in mind the noble words of the excellent Hooker, which I quote from memory: "Of Justice what less can be said than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage—the least as needing her protection, the greatest as not exempted from her power."

INDEX TO PART I.

ABDUL HAMID adverse to reforms in favour of the Christians, 139
Aberdeen, Lord, speech of, in 1828, 5. Accused of being "over-Russian," 5. Considered the Crimean war unjust and unnecessary, 51. Resignation of, in 5, 51
Abyssinia, war declared by the Khedive against, 52
Aden and Perim, annexation of, by England, 53
Adrianople, treaty of, 9
Affghan War, 7. Opinions of Mr. Kaye and Sir H. Edwardes, 7
Akerman, treaty of, 42, 63
Albanian Mahometans, their hostility to the Turks, 212
Albanians, dialects of, 212. Harmony in which they live with the Greeks, 213
Alexander I. described by Alison, 24
Alison, his description of Turkish barbarity, 114. On Poland, 160
Alma, exposed position of the English troops in the attack, 50
America, sale by Russia of her possessions in, 41
American taxation, description of, by Sydney Smith,
American War of Independence, 194
Andrassy Note, the, its provisions, 63
Antonelli, Cardinal, 185. *Truth's* account of, 186
Arabian superstitions, 103
Argyll, Duke of, on the selfish policy of the present Government, 244
Army, Turkish, its faulty commissariat arrangements, 148
Ashbury, Mr., his address to his constituents, 231. Its egregious errors, 231
Asia Minor, populations of, 216
Atrocities, Turkish, 114, 144, 147
Attorney-General, attack of, on Mr. Gladstone, 233

BALANCE of power a mischievous fiction, 16
Barbary pirates, their traffic in slaves, 120
Baring, Mr., his report on the Turkish atrocities, 65
Bashi-Bazouks, 66, 122, 137, 145
Beaconsfield, Lord, his speech at the Guildhall, 74. His attack on Mr. Gladstone, 233. Prophetic character of his "Tancred" 239. His war policy, 240
Berlin Memorandum, the, recommendations of, 69. Refusal of England to support, 70
Bianconi, M., works of, on Turkey, 214
Bismarck, Prince, on the friendly relations of Germany and Russia, 97
Black Sea, limitation of the Russian fleet in, 51; and consequent abandonment of the Christians to Turkey, 51
Black Sea, our trade in the, 195
Blockade, Turkish, inefficiency of the, 93
Bondholders, Turkish, 134
Bosnia, Vice-Consul Blunt on its capacity for freedom, 137
Burke, Mr. speech of, 3
Brigandage, Greek, 225. Responsibility of Turkey for, 227
British Snob, Thackeray on the, 17
Bulgaria, refusal of Turkey to an armed occupation of, 52. Insurrection in, 65. British army in, 120. Destruction of property in, 58. Vice-Consul Blunt on its capacity for freedom, 137

Bulgarian atrocities, the, 64, 166, 129, 145. Ordered by the Turkish Government, 75. Lord Granville on, 124
Bulgarians, massacre of, 138
Bulgarians, south of the Balkans, mostly of Hellenic descent, 213. M. Bianconi's opinion of, 214
Bulwer, Sir H., on Turkish rule, 147
Burghley, Lord, and the electors of North Northamptonshire, 178
Byron, Lord, and the cause of Greek independence, 200

CALIPHATE, the, false claims of the Sultans of Turkey to, 110
Canaris, his heroism in the Greek War of Independence, 207
Candia, 52
Carnarvon, Lord, speech of, in 1829, 6
Casimir V., his invasion of the Ukraine, 156. His abdication, 156. His prophecy of the dismemberment of Poland, 156
Central Asia, Russian advance in, 39. Earl of Beaconsfield on the, 12
Chatham, Lord, remark of, 3
Chefket Pasha, 74
Christian races in Turkey and Asia Minor often mistaken for Turks, 211
Christians, protection of the, by Russia sanctioned by treaty, 44. Turkish treatment of, 59, 120
Circassians, Mr. Douglas Freshfield on the Russian treatment of, 10. Their barbarity, 145. Means of subsistence, 225.
Codrington, Admiral, honour conferred on him by the Czar after the victory of Navarino, 8
Conference, the, 74. Refusal by Turkey of its proposals, 7. Withdrawal of the Ambassadors from Constantinople, 77. England the cause of its failure, 78
Conservative party, the, and the licensed victuallers, 240
Constantinople, occupation of, by Russia, in 1833, 43
Constitution, the new Turkish, 55. Remarks of Lord Derby on, 125. The *Times* on its working, 129. The very opposite of a reform, 132
Consuls, assassination of the French and German, at Salonica, 65, 82
Cracow, its annexation to Austria, 157. Approval of Lord Palmerston of the annexation, 157
Credit, Russian and Turkish, 39
Crimean War, humane treatment of English prisoners, 11. Futility of its results, 36. A foolish and wicked war 46. Weakness and cowardice of Austria, 46, 47. The English ultimatum, 47; and the Czar's reply, 47. Policy of Prussia, 47. Mr. G. A. Sala on, 98. Kinglake on the attitude of England at its commencement, 242
Cromwell, his massacres of the Irish, and confiscation of their property, 165
Czar, the, his promises and assurances to England, 74
Czars, Russian, their ability, 25

DARDANELLES, blockade of the, in 1828, exemption of the English from its operation, 8
Debt of Russia, the, mode of paying interest on, during the Crimean War, 11
Declaration, the Russian, 80, 82. Rejected by Turkey, 83
Derby, Lord, his dispatch of May 1, 1877, 86. How the dispatch is viewed in Russia, 89
Despotism, a benevolent, better than oppressive parliamentary government, 171
Dining *à la Russe*, 23
Dobrudscha, laid waste by the Turks, 122

EASTERN QUESTION, the, the *Times* on our policy, 31. Sketch of past phases of the, 36. Policy of England not always to defend Turkey against Russia, 41; but frequently hostile to Turkey, 42. Solution of, 57. History of the present phase of, 58. Remarks of Mr. Gladstone on, 122; of Lord Hartington, 125; of Lord Derby, 126; of the Earl of Dudley, 126; of Sir W. Harcourt, 128; of the Duke of Wellington, 197. The *Times* on the defects of our policy, 208. Mr. Gladstone on the Hellenic factor in, 219. Policy of England selfish and discreditable, 242. Duke of Argyll on the policy of the present government, 244.
Education in Russia, 238
Egypt, possession of, by Russia, not a menace to India, 195
Elliott, Sir H., dispatch on the Turkish atrocities, 242
English aggression, 17
English Cabinet, parties in, 53
English character, impressions of Heine, 17; of De Tocqueville, 18

FRANCE, advantages to, of Russian alliance, 28.

Freeman on Mahometanism, 105
Free-trade, Mr. Cobden on the Turkish system of, 135
Forster, Mr. W. E., on Turkish atrocities, 145
Fox, Mr., speeches of, 3

GLADSTONE, Mr., resignation of, in 1855, 51. His pamphlet on the Bulgarian atrocities, 66. Speech on the Eastern Question, 122. On the Hellenic factor in the Eastern problem, 219. The recent attacks on, 230; by Mr. Ashbury, 231; by the Attorney-General, 233; by the Earl of Beaconsfield, 233. Remarks on our military and naval expenses, 240.
Gortschakoff, Prince, dispatch of, 85
Government of Turkey, the, a system of corruption and fraud, 136
Grajdavine of St. Petersburg, extract from an article in the, 89
Greco-Russian Church, points of difference from the Roman Catholic faith, 20. Cause of separation from the Latin Church, 20.
Greece, the, of 1830, M. Leroy-Beaulieu on, 227. Turkish atrocities in, 56, 202
Greek and Bulgarian Churches, the schism between, 222
Greek bishops, massacre of, by the Turks, 221
Greek Church, Orthodox, voluntary entry of United Greeks of Poland into the, 182. Caution of the Russian Government in their admission, 182
Greek clergy, their liberal feeling, 221
Greek Empire, Reconstruction of, 197. Russian interests in restoring, 209
Greek language and the Christian religion, 219
Greek Patriarch, the, 55
Greeks, the, the authors of European civilization, 198. Their former pre-eminence in literature, science, and art, 198; and heroism in war, 199. The Renaissance the result of Greek literature and taste, 199. Their bravery in modern warfare, 199. Aptitude for commerce, 208, 229. De Tocqueville on jealousy, 210. Their numbers and influence in European Turkey underrated, 211, 213. Their progress since the War of Independence, 221 229.
Greek War of Independence, 56. Its origin in Turkish injustice and oppression, 200. Melancholy event by which preceded, 200. Sacrifices of Lord Byron 202. Massacres and barbarities of the Turks, 202, 203. Heroism of the Greeks, 202. Battle of Navarino, 204. Course pursued by England censured by Lord Palmerston, 206. Heroism of Canaris, 207. Losses and sacrifices of the Greeks, 208
Grey, Lord, considered the Crimean War unnecessary and unjustifiable, 51

HERZEGOVINA, treatment of the peasantry, 58, 61. Reforms promised in, 62
Hobart Pasha, 92. Mr. Freeman's animadversions on, 93
Hobhouse, Mr., on our alliance with Turkey
Holland, Lord, on our alliance with Turkey, speeches of, 4
House of Commons, the, illustrations of cases brought before a Committee of Privileges, 172. Macaulay's opinion of, 174. The Home Rule Members in, 175. Defective machinery of, 175. Discussion of Scotch Bills, 177

IGNATIEFF, General, 59
India, danger to, by Russian occupation of Constantinople, 37, 41. Impossibility of a successful Russian invasion of, 189. Its pecuniary value to us, 190. Its revenue, 191. The opium traffic, 191. Our army in, 191. Rapid outgrowth of its population, 191. Our trade with, 192
Indian Mutiny, non-intervention of Russia during, 11
Indian nightmare, the, 189
Integrity of the Ottoman Empire, first support given by the English army to maintain the, 43. Russia joins with England, 43
Ireland, the English Poland, 162. English treachery, injustice, and cruelty in, 163, 168. Massacres in, by Cromwell, 165.
Irish, the, exclusion of, from the benefits of English law, 162. Insulted by King John, 162

JANISSARIES, massacre of the, 113. Their cruelty to the peasantry, 146
Jesuits, effects of their influence in Poland, 184
Jews, their treatment by the Greeks, 217. Freedom enjoyed by, in Greece, 217
Jury, the English and Scotch systems of trial by, 177

KAINARDJI, treaty of, 44
Khalil Cherif Pasha, 58. Recall of, 60

Khivan campaign, excellent conduct of the Russians, 9
Kilkenny, Statute of, its restrictions, 162

Layard, Mr., on cruelties to the Christians, 147
Leroy-Beaulieu, M., on the Greece of 1830, 227
L'Huys, M. Drouyn de, resignation of, in 1855, 50
Lies invented about Russia, Thackeray's satirical sketch of, 1
Louis Napoleon, his overtures to the Czar rejected, 15

Macaulay, his opinion of the House of Commons, 174
Mackintosh, Sir James, speech of, in 1828, 4. Speech on Russian forbearance, 119
Mahomet, his immoral character, 103. His marriage to Ayesha, 103. Superstitions respecting him, 103
Mahometanism, unmasked, 102. Illustrations of, 102. Propagated by the sword, 105
Mahometan religion, the, the Sultan not the head of, 106. Tolerance of the Russians towards, 183
Mahometans, their supposed sympathy with Turkey, 56. Their treatment of women, 102. Their distribution, 107. Contempt of Albanian Mahometans for the Turks, 217
Mansfield, Col., refutation of, 180. His report of no authority or value, 180
Maps, the author's ethnological or Stanford, 211, 213. M. Bianconi's, 214. Kiepert's, 215
Martel, Charles, his victory at Tours, 104
Mecca, Shereef of, 106.
Mediterranean, British and French influence on the, 48
Mehemet Ali, his rebellion against the Sultan, 107
Melegari, M., speeches of, 76
Midhat Pasha, 54
Misgovernment, Turkish, Consul Calvert on, 140. Sir H. Bulwer on, 147
Mobilisation, Russian, cost of, 83
Montenegrins, dispatches of Prince Nicholas and Consul Monson on their treatment of Turkish prisoners, 149, 150
Moscow, burning of, 8
Moscow Slavic Committee, expenditure of, 60

Navarino, battle of, 41, 115, 204
Negroes, mutilation of, for the harems, 146
Nestorian Christians, Mr. Layard on Turkish cruelties to, 147
Newspapers, suppression of Turkish, 148
Nicholas, the Emperor, 26, 220. Suppression of the revolt on his accession, 26
Nicholas, Prince of Montenegro, his magnanimity, 145
North, Lord, policy of, in 1791, 3

Opium, our Indian traffic in, with China, 191
Osmanlis, the, 212
Ottoman domination, results of, 57

Palmerston, Lord, said to be bribed by Russia, 2. Speech of, in 1829, 6; in 1833, 6. Sir H. Bulwer on his change of policy towards Russia, 6. Accused of garbling dispatches to provoke the Affghan War, 7. His opinions on the Greek question, 204, 205, 206.
Papacy, Sir James Stephens on its crimes, 183
Parga, surrender of, by the British to Turkey, 201. Patriotism of the Greeks before its cession, 200
Parliamentary institutions in America a bar to the emancipation of the slaves, 236
Parliament, the first Turkish, the recent elections for, 121
Parnell, Mr., speech in the House of Commons, 175
Pashas, their usually mercenary character, 61
Paskiewitch, campaign of, in Asia Minor, 9. His noble conduct towards the Turks, 9. Results of his generous policy, 9
Patriarchs of the Greek Church men of high character, 185
Peter the Great, will of, proved to be a forgery, 33
Plague, the, 122
Poland, partition of, 154. State of, before its partition, 154. Its dismal history, 155. Serfdom in, 156. Liberal Constitution granted to, by the Emperor Alexander, 157. From a common sense point of view, 154. Invasion of Russia by, 154. Conquest of, by Sweden, 154. Decline of the Protestant cause in, 184. The revolution in, and the Russian means of repression, 158. Future policy of, 160. Abolition of its constitution, 160.
Ireland, the English, 162

Poles, their cruel treatment by the Swedes, 156. By the Austrians, 158. Their cruelty, 158
Polish nobility, the, 155. Massacre of, by the Austrians, 158
Pope, despotism of his spiritual rule, 183. Doctrine of the Infallibility, 183
Popery, Sydney Smith's description of, 184
Present Phase of the Eastern Question, history of, 58
Principalities, the, 46. Evacuation of, by the Russians, 49. Their relation to Turkey, 51. Occupation of by Austria, 52
Prisons, overcrowding in Turkish, 138.
Protestantism in Poland, decline of, 184
Protocol, the Russian, 78. Its terms, 79. Its provisions for mutual disarmament, 80. Refusal of Turkey to submit to, 83
Punch, cartoon, British interests and Turkish independence, 241

REDIF PASHA, fraudulent transactions of, 61
Representative system in England, defects of, 235
Respect and regard formerly entertained in England towards Russia, 3. Present feeling in America, 12; in Japan, 13; in Armenia, 14; among the Croatians, 14; among the Czechs of Bohemia, 14
Results of the present Russo-Turkish war, a forecast of the probable, 95
Rifle, superiority of the Turkish range, 31
Ristich, M., on Turkish atrocities in Servia, 137, 144
Roads in Turkey, want of, 135
Roman Catholic Church, instance of its inconsistency, 183. Cruelties and absurdities of, 185
Roman Catholics, persecution of, in Ireland, 166, 167
Rushdi Pasha, speech of, 55
Russell, Lord John, resignation of, in 1855
Russia, the truth about, 1. Incidents of our relationship with, 8. Its free institutions, 19. Education, its cost, 21. Foreign loans, 21. Railways and telegraphs, 21. Our trade with, 21. Punishment of death abolished, 22. Justified in declaring war, 37. Forbearance of, 129. Its need of a constitutional Government, 235, 238. Voltaire on its rapid progress, 238. Education in, 238
Russian annexation, 18
Russian army, excellent discipline of the troops, 28, 29, 95. Their respect for the dead, 28. Their joyful reception in Bulgaria, 30
Russian Empire, the Liberal party almost its only friends in England, 235
Russian prisoners, our refusal to exchange, 8
Russians, in Central Asia, 12, 39. Their fluency in speaking French, 23. Their loyalty, 237.
Russo-Turkish war, the *Saturday Review* on English public opinion on the, 1. The American press on English intervention, 12. The vacillating policy of England its chief cause, 85. Its probable results, 95. The Egyptian contingent, 107. Mutilation of Russian soldiers, 122
Rutland, Duke of, his views on Lord Derby's despatch, 87

SAFVET PASHA, his remarks on the Bulgarian massacres, 76
Sala, Mr. G. A., on the Crimean war, 98
Salisbury, Lord, his instructions for the Conference, 74. His visit to Berlin, 75; to Rome, 76. His support of the cause of the Christians, 239
Sandford, Mr., M.P., on the Eastern Question, 100
Schuyler, Mr., his account of the Bulgarian atrocities, 67
Scios, massacre at, 56
Scotland, rebellions in, English barbarities in their suppression, 168
Sebastopol, siege of, unfavourable positions of the English troops, 50
"Secret Dispatches of General Ignatieff," 59, 61
Serfs, emancipation of, its cost, 12, 236
Servia, resolves upon war with Turkey, 71. Aided by Russian volunteers, 71. Her reverses, 71. Terms of peace proposed by the Porte, 71. Armistice, 72. Turkish atrocities in, 137, 144
Servir Pasha, 62
Slaves, traffic in, by Turkey, 119, 146; and by Egypt, 146
Slavonians, jealousy between the Greeks and, 210. Idioms of, 211
Smollett's poem, "The Tears of Scotland," 168
South Arabia, Turkish aggressions in, checked by England, 53
Stephens, Sir James, on the crimes of the Papacy, 185
Suez Canal, 91, 92. Blockade of the, 195

Sultan, the, not the head of the Mahometan religion, 106, 110. Sketch of the present, 108
Sultans, treatment by the Turks of their, 107
Syria, occupation of, by the French, 52, 73

TAXATION, Turkish system of, 135
Thackeray, sketches by, 1, 23, 111
"The Unspeakable Turk," 113
Times correspondent, sketch of a visit to Turkish officials, 151. Description of Turkish homes, 152
Torture, modes of, by the Turks, 141
Trade of England with Turkey, decrease of, 151
Translation of this work into Russian, 234
Treaty of the Paris, repudiation of, by Russia, 52
Truth about Russia, the, 1
Tunis annexed to Turkey, 52
Turkey, its revenue and expenditure, 151. Education in, 216
Turkish army, the English officers with, 28, Condition of, 95. Inefficiency of, 140
Turkish army and navy, their inefficiency, 39. Venality of their leaders, 39
Turkish atrocities, the, 124, 130, 137, 145, 149, 202. Sir H. Elliott on, 242
Turkish credit, 134. Midhat Pasha's opinion of, 56
Turkish fleet, destroyed at Sinope, 45
Turkish homes, destitute of household utensils, 152
Turkish Ministry, constant changes in, 140
Turks, their baseness of character, 56, 62, 64, 113, 114, 115, 123, 127, 143. Emigration of, from Greece, 217
Turkey, our alliance with, 115

UNITED GREEK CHURCH, Colonel Mansfield's report relating to, refuted, 180

VIENNA, conference at, in 1853, 45. Note proposed by plenipotentiaries, 45
Voltaire, friendly sentiments of, towards Russia, 3. Sketch of the condition of Poland before its partition, 154. On Russian progress, 238

WELLINGTON, Duke of, M. Thiers on his genius as a soldier and statesman, 198
Will of Peter the Great, proved to be a forgery, 33. M. Theodore Juste's work on, 33. Lesur's abridgment of, 33. First published complete by Gaillardet, 33
Women, contempt and distrust of, by Mahometans, 102. Violation of, 138

A

DEFENCE OF RUSSIA,

AND THE

CHRISTIANS OF TURKEY.

APPENDIX

TO

SIR T. SINCLAIR'S

DEFENCE OF RUSSIA

AND THE

CHRISTIANS OF TURKEY.

LONDON:
CHAPMAN AND HALL, PICCADILLY.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. H. AND L. COLLINGRIDGE,
ALDERSGATE STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

SOME CURIOUS AND COMIC INCIDENTS OF THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION 1

PART OF MR. GLADSTONE'S SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION 8

MR. GLADSTONE ON RUSSIAN DEEDS IN TURKISTAN . . 13

MR. BRIGHT ON THE EASTERN QUESTION 24

EXTRACT FROM WALLACE'S "RUSSIA" 31

EXTRACTS FROM MR. FREEMAN'S "OTTOMAN POWER IN EUROPE" 36

TRANSLATION OF COMTE SEEBACH'S "OPEN LETTER" TO LORD BEACONSFIELD, PUBLISHED IN THE "NORD" OF BRUSSELS, ON 23RD JUNE, 1877. 42

INTERVIEW BETWEEN AN ENGLISHMAN AND A TURKISH PASHA 57

SKETCH OF MANNERS IN THE EAST, BY THACKERAY . . 62

EXTRACT FROM "RIDE TO KHIVA," FROM "PUNCH" . . 66

"PUNCH" ON ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES . . . 68

A FEW REMARKS ON THE ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES . 71

SOME REMARKS ON BARON HENRY DE WORMS' BOOK ON "ENGLAND'S POLICY IN THE EAST" 98

LORD R. MONTAGU'S "FOREIGN POLICY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION" 108

"THE JEWS THE IMPLACABLE FOES OF THE CHRISTIANS" . 112

OPINIONS ON TURKEY BY TRAVELLERS OF VARIOUS NATIONALITIES 155

PROFESSOR MARTENS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION . . 176

"THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE BUFFOON" (LORD BEACONSFIELD), POLITICAL SQUIB, 1874 178

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE AID OF THE WOUNDED IN WAR AND THE STAFFORD HOUSE COMMITTEE . . 181

PHOTOGRAPH OF AN M.P., BY DICKENS 231

"THE GREAT BATTLE OF KATSH-TARTAR BAZARDJIK" . 241

AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE UTTER IMPOSSIBILITY OF PERSUADING ENGLISHMEN TO BELIEVE ANYTHING CONTRARY TO THEIR PRECONCEIVED NOTIONS . . . 249

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND AUTHORITIES QUOTED . . 251

APPENDIX.

SOME CURIOUS AND COMIC INCIDENTS OF THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

I PROCEED to make a few remarks on the great debate on the Eastern Question, in which I took part myself, which lasted five nights, and on which occasion fifty-one members spoke, whilst many others were "crushed out" of the discussion, which occupies about sixty columns of the *Times*. By far the larger portion of the speeches were, as Byron said of a speech of Wilberforce, "Words, words, nothing but words," with hardly any ideas, facts, or arguments—in short, even more insipid than those articles in magazines which are known as padding. A large number of members only profess—and rather glory in—complete ignorance of foreign languages and foreign politics, and they remind me of a lady who had spent some years in Italy, and who, on being asked if she had acquired the Italian language, said she had escaped wonderfully well.

In the discussion which preceded the debate the Chancellor of the Exchequer fully and candidly admitted that the Conservatives were the stupid party, and if it had been my fate to have followed him I would certainly have said, "It would be rude to contradict you." Lord Sandon, at a later period of the debate, congratulated himself on his party having been at last elevated by Mr. Childers into "an

intellectual party," but this opinion found no support on the Liberal side, and the course pursued by the Conservatives must have soon dissipated Mr. Childers' amiable delusion, and I am inclined to think that some of them who had received a classical education were under the impression that the true meaning of the words *rus in urbe*, which they had learned at Eton, was that the *Russian* should never be allowed to put his foot in the *City* of Constantinople, like the witty politician who supported a motion for taxing the funds on the words, *Quodcunque infundis ascescit.*

Many of those who spoke relied wholly for their materials on preceding speeches, and served up the same indigestible and unpalatable hash time after time with a refinement of cruelty to the wearied listeners of which even a Turk would hardly have been guilty. Some of them had a faint notion that there had been a rebellion in Herzegovina and a massacre in Bulgaria, but whether these provinces were north, south, east, or west of the Balkans, they had not the faintest idea. Then they had heard of the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, and the Protocol; and the Philo-Turks were told by their leaders that these documents meant coercion, and coercion meant war and destruction of British interests, and that the Ministers had acted right, whilst the Philo-Christians held that the policy of Ministers was wrong, that coercion was the only way of avoiding a bloody war, and that there was no fear of British interests being imperilled, and we had the permutations and combinations on these and a few other topics, which, by the rules of arithmetic, amount to an almost infinite number.

A most ludicrous feature of the debates in the House of Commons, especially on great occasions, is to observe the anxiety with which members who intend to speak watch for the conclusion of the speech of the member actually addressing the House, and the look of discomfiture and disgust which they assume when, after one legitimate peroration, the orator—as, alas! they often do (especially front benchers, who seem, though often excruciatingly wearisome, to think that their dignity requires that they should speak at considerable length)—indulges himself (but not his audience) in a second or even a third peroration; and, if he halts for a moment to take breath or a sip of water, and there is a false start, you may often observe a

dozen members rise, like so many postboys in the saddle. At last when the speaker comes to a full stop, there is another uprising of possibly a score of members, like a covey of partridges, and then the Speaker, who has been previously told by the whips on both sides who is to speak next (who is supposed to be the individual who first catches the Speaker's eye), calls out the name of the selected person, and sometimes sees a man of the most diminutive proportions behind a Daniel Lambert, and the others, chopfallen, have to resume their seats, often amidst the humiliating titters of the audience; and I myself was not called, after rising more than a score of times, till the fifth night of the debate. Nothing can be more absurd and undignified than the whole proceeding, and it is obviously unfair and undesirable, as small, aged, infirm, and plainly-dressed speakers cannot be expected to catch the Speaker's eye as rapidly as colossal, young, and vigorous men, with perhaps a very conspicuous cravat or other article of attire; and in all other countries there is either a ballot for precedence in speaking, or else each member is taken in the order in which he writes his name in the list of intending speakers; but in England even Liberals are apt to think any English custom absolutely perfect, however clearly absurd to any unprejudiced mind; even the cruelties which disgrace the English public schools, such as fagging, bullying, flogging, and "tunding" little boys by older and stronger youths, which caused a poor little Blue-coat School boy the other day in sheer despair to commit suicide.

The extreme right of the pro-Russian position was at first occupied by Mr. Courtney, who was favourably heard on that night, whilst he spoke on a subsequent day in favour of woman's rights amidst that unceasing storm of interruption which in France is called a charivari. Mr. Courtney advocated the immediate and gradual dismemberment of Turkey for its own preservation, just as the amputation of a mortified limb sometimes saves the human body, and he was in favour of the coercion of Turkey by England and Russia alone, if the other Powers would not join; but I myself went a step further, and held that we should even have coerced Turkey single-handed, if Russia and the other Powers would not have joined us.

The furthest advanced post on the Philo-Turkish side, in the

absence of Butler Johnstone Pasha, was occupied by Dr. Kenealy, after whom Elcho Effendi was a bad second. The House learned some very surprising facts from the learned doctor, which might fitly be placed in a new edition of the veracious and amusing life of Baron Munchausen; but the extravagance and absurdity of his language injured his own cause so that the advocates of Turkey must have exclaimed, "Save us from our friends; as to our enemies, we can take care of them ourselves." Previously, however, to arriving at this climax of absurdity, which turned the debate into a screaming farce, I must notice a few of the other speeches.

Mr. Cross, though his speech was, on the whole, business-like and sensible, committed himself to the following very absurd statements. "Why the Suez Canal should be attacked by Russia in any shape I cannot imagine." Sydney Smith tells us that it requires a surgical operation to get a Scotchman to understand a joke; and it would require apparently some such process to excite the sluggish imagination of the Home Secretary. Egypt, as part of Turkey, is at war with Russia, and if the lukewarm Khedive joined the Sultan heartily in the war, and proposed to despatch as many troops as he did to Abyssinia, namely, 50,000 men or more, instead of the 12,000 he is now sending, it would be then of the utmost importance to Russia, not only to take possession of the Suez Canal, allowing neutral traffic to continue, but to occupy the whole of Egypt. He then goes on to say, "Take another place in which the world is interested. I mean Egypt." But having thus "taken Egypt" (I write from the report in the *Times*), he does not say what he or Russia should do with it, but rushes with breathless speed to the Dardanelles; and then he winds up magnificently with the following rather presumptuous sentence, "Is it necessary for carrying on the war between Russia and Turkey, and for the protection of the Christians in Turkey, that Constantinople should be either attacked, approached, or occupied? I say, 'No.'" In other words, "Sic volo sic jubeo stet pro ratione voluntas." It takes one's breath away to see that a Cabinet Minister, who has never had even the most superficial knowledge of military affairs, should actually take it upon him to pronounce *ex cathedrâ* that it could not be necessary for carrying on the war that Constantinople even should be

approached! Why, it is impossible to carry on the war at all without a forward movement, which is necessarily an approach to Constantinople, unless Mr. Cross's idea of carrying on war is to remain stationary, or perhaps that the Russians should obtain a victory by retreating from their frontier towards Archangel or Siberia. It has been held as an axiom, since the creation of the world, that the shortest and most effectual way to vanquish an enemy is to aim at his heart, and in the case of a hostile country, to attack the capital; and if the Germans, for instance, had not marched upon Paris in the Franco-German war they would never have attained so signal and speedy a victory. This new Moltke of the Ministry should give a course of lectures on tactics and strategy, and no doubt the Russians will be curious to listen to the arguments on which this extraordinary opinion is based.

I come now to Lord Sandon, who said he "confessed that at one time this session he began to feel despondent as to the prospects of the Conservative party." This tallies with what Lord Beaconsfield had said in the autumn, that "it would be affectation in me to pretend that the policy of the Government is backed by the country;" and proves that they know they are acting counter to the wishes of the nation, and are therefore bound in honour to dissolve, as Mr. Gladstone did with double the majority, and appeal to the country.

We had then a most sensible and excellent speech from Mr. Baxter, in a House containing about a dozen members, in which he told us that Sir Henry Elliott "was a much greater believer in the Turks than the Turks were in themselves." He "saw a good many Turkish Pashas, and all of them gloried in having none of their money invested in the Turkish funds."

I will now briefly notice the frothy but amusing speech of Sir Robert Peel, which went in at one ear and out at the other, leaving Mr. Forster only one remark to answer, namely, that the hon. baronet had said that the Liberals "are hungry wolves without a shepherd;" but, as the House of Commons is neither quick nor critical, and easily amused with the feeblest attempt at wit, this Irish bull was not detected till the speech was over, when Mr. Forster quietly observed that "we might be hungry, and we might be wolves, but in that case it is not likely we should want a shepherd."

I now come to Mr. Bourke's speech, who "put his foot into it" with a vengeance, as I shall proceed to show in the following amazing passage:—"The hon. member (Mr. Courtney) said the Turkish fleet was commanded by Englishmen; that there was not a single ironclad in it which did not depend for navigation on an English engineer; and that, if war broke out between England and Turkey, the consequence would be that the Ottoman fleet would be reduced to inaction unless the English on board would forego their nationality. *They received the money of Turkey on the faith that they were to stick to their ships in time of war, and that to throw over their master would be to play the part of a traitor.*" This extraordinary statement was received with cheers from the Conservatives, who would equally have cheered an assertion that black was white, and I suppose we ought to receive it as a maxim of law laid down by no less a person than the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that in case England went to war with Turkey, it would not be treason, as we hitherto supposed, for Englishmen in the Turkish service to fight against their country, but it would be treason for them to refuse to fight against it! The force of absurdity could hardly go further. He further remarked that "it was important in the present emergency, for the sake, not only of this country, but of the world, to show Europe *and the universe* that we were a united people." Now, there was not a single member of Parliament on either side who had a word to say against the first resolution, and if the Government had only agreed to it, as many on their own side wished, and Colonel Lindsay expressly recommended, we should have presented precisely that firm and united front to the world which Mr. Bourke desired, but hardly "to the universe," as he enthusiastically wished, since the heavenly bodies can hardly be expected to take an interest in the attitude of even so august a body as the British Parliament.

Lord Elcho subsequently, with his usual "bumptiousness" and self-confidence, in which the House does not share in the smallest degree, roundly stated that "Lord Salisbury and those who went out with him were entirely ignorant of the character of the Turkish mind, and of the feelings and sentiments of the country; and they disregarded altogether the warnings of those who were acquainted with the position of affairs at the Porte." There are thus three policies before the

country—that of the Government, that of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Elcho, in which, however, I believe he has not a sing —"*l'état c'est moi.*" Lord Elcho, with more temerity than avowed the opinion "that by the first week in July Russia at Adrianople, and that by the first week in August she wo Constantinople; others put it sooner." We have now August, and the Russians have not yet completely cro Danube, so that the oracular prediction of Lord Elcho ha slightest chance of fulfilment.

I will now refer to Major O'Gorman's speech, in which h the hitherto unimagined fact that "among the Bashi-B Spaniards, Portuguese, Frenchmen, Hollanders, Prussian Austrians, Hungarians, Italians, Greeks, Maltese, Cretans, Samians, and even Trojans! There were also Russian ventured to say that, if they were paraded to-morrow Wellington Barracks, it would be found that 75 per them were Russian troops sent by the Emperor Alexan the purpose of committing the atrocities, paid with R money, and probably commanded by Russian officers." I fe House of Commons and the country are not sufficiently grate the Irish for returning the gallant Major and other Home Rul enlighten us on these and other points, which are utterly unkn and would not be believed in any part of Europe. We r come to the acme of absurdity, in the shape of Dr. Kenea speech, in which he made the following astounding statemer "Every person in Bulgaria had at this moment as m local liberty as was enjoyed anywhere. The number of perso destroyed by the Bashi-Bazouks did not probably exceed 4,000 or 5,000. We considered ourselves to be at the head of civilization and Christianity, and yet the number of persons we had massacred in putting down rebellions would amount to the same number of millions;" so that, according to Dr. Kenealy, England has massacred at least four thousand millions, or about four times the entire population of the globe!!!

The House of Commons and the country, until this immortal speech, were not aware of the enormous and unprecedented influence wielded by Dr. Kenealy, for it appears from his account of

s trumpeter apparently being dead), that he carries him the whole House of Commons, except one member ley), which no other man ever did since Parliament existed, overwhelming numbers of his countrymen:—"Now, place in this House, I myself warn Russia, speaking of millions, speaking the voice of all present with the single of the honourable member behind me, that if she attempted Egypt, Constantinople, or the Euphrates valley, England sist her to the last drop of her blood." I can imagine that sians must have trembled when they read this crushing how they must have thanked their stars that Dr. Kenealy ought to be—having the entire House of Commons, all man, in his favour—Prime Minister of England, with, the Claimant as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. the sole but formidable occupant (a host in himself) Opposition benches. It is refreshing to turn from these ties of the debate to the able but rather prolix speech of ladstone, from which I extract the following admirable pas- the latter forming the conclusion of this powerful oration.

RT OF MR. GLADSTONE'S SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

"I DO not deny that coercion involves the possibility of war; but I say that history shows that coercion, adequately supported and in a good cause, need not be followed by war. I hope the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs has given up his view that Mr. Canning did not contemplate the use of force. Although the Treaty of 1827 did not use the word 'force,' yet in its additional articles it as plainly contemplated it as if the word had been actually employed. In the instructions which were subsequently given to the Admirals the word 'force' was used. The battle of Navarino, although a

result of the employment of force, was not war. The wh
history is full of such examples of coercion. In 1832
coercion of Holland by the united action of England an
England on that occasion blockaded the Scheldt. Anothe
occurred in 1850, when Greece was compelled to subm
principal claims of England in the case of Don Pacific
undisguised use of coercion. Coercion was again, in 1853,
to Greece to prevent her from taking any part—her actio
of course, be adverse to Turkey—in the Crimean War. I
too, in the case of Turkey herself, coercion was used as a th
England and the other Powers, and it was that which induc
to agree to the occupation of the Lebanon. Now, in not
those five instances was there a state of war. Well, amon
strangest fictions which have been set abroad by those who t
contrary view from that which I am advocating, is the existence
hardy, indomitable—as it has been termed by the First Lord o
Admiralty—pluck in Turkey. Indomitable pluck! Most indo
table, undoubtedly, in destroying women and children in Bulga
and in campaigns against the ploughmen and swineherds of Ser
Where, I would ask, was this indomitable pluck when she had
meet the heroic soldiers of Montenegro? In the course of yea
and of revolution, almost every capital in Europe has been occupi
by hostile troops, but Turkey has never waited for the occupatio
of her capital. Long before her enemy has reached Constantinop
she has taken care to make her peace. Therefore, from our whole
experience of Turkey, it is an idle and visionary pretext to suppose
that war between Turkey and united Europe, or war even between
Turkey and any great combination of the Powers, would have been
the result of a threat of coercion. But, sir, is there a united
Europe? There never has been a united Europe, but only because
you prevented it. Russia said to Turkey, 'You must.' Austria
was willing to undertake naval operations. We have no evidence
that France would have declined, but in November France was
aware that England would have no coercion, and France then held
aloof. Another doctrine has been set up by the Chancellor of the
Exchequer. He says that no country gets any benefit from the use
of foreign arms. But if a country has a tyrannical government,

bstitute for it a free government, that is, I think, a v
overnment. That was done in Spain in the Peninsu
t was done for Belgium in 1830. The liberties of Gre
were established by the use of foreign arms—in
taly by the arms first of France and then of G
he liberties of Portugal were established and c
y Mr. Canning in 1826 by the use of foreign ar
erties of the United States themselves were only esta
y the powerful aid they received from foreign arm
t hesitate to say that the cause of the revolted subjects
against their oppressors is as holy a cause as ever animate
ast, or as ever stirred the hand of man. Sir, what part ar
play? Looking at this latter controversy—the controvers
en Turkey and her subjects—the horrible massacres of las
the proofs which had been afforded that they are only part
ndications of a system, that their recurrence is to be ex
d, and is a matter of moral certainty if they are now allowe
ass with impunity—looking at the total want of result from
d Derby's efforts, at that mockery which had been cast in our
th in return for what I quite admit was upon ordinary principles
insulting despatch. Can we, sir, say with regard to this great
ttle of freedom against oppression which is now going on, which
as been renewed from time to time, and for which one-third of the
opulation of Bosnia and Herzegovina are at this moment not only
uffering exile, but, terrible to say, absolute starvation, upon which
depends the fate of millions of the subject races that inhabit the
Turkish Empire—can we, with all this b , be content with what
I will call a vigorous array of remonst ell intended, I grant,
but without result, as the policy of th untry? Can we, I
say, looking upon that battle, lay upon our hearts
and, in the face of God and man, say t to it, 'We have
well and sufficiently performed our p re were other days
when England was the hope of Fre ver in the world a
hig' aspiration was entertained or as struck, it was
to England that the eyes of the oppr ys turned—to this
favourite, this darling home of so mu d so much happi-
ness, where the people that had bui ice for themselves

would, it was well known, be ready to do what in them lay to secure the benefit of the same inestimable boon for others. You talk to me of the established tradition in regard to Turkey. I appeal to the established tradition, older, wider, nobler far—a tradition not which disregards British interests, but which teaches you to seek the promotion of those interests in obeying the dictates of honour and of justice. And, sir, what is to be the end of this? Are we to identify the fantastic ideas some people entertain about this policy and that policy with British interests, and then fall down and worship them? Or are we to look, not at the sentiment, but at the hard facts of the case, which Lord Derby told us fifteen years ago, namely, that it is the population of those countries that will ultimately possess them—that will ultimately determine their future condition? It is to this that we should look, and there is now before the world a glorious prize. A portion of these people are making an effort to retrieve what they have lost—I mean those in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another portion—a band of heroes such as the world has rarely seen—stand on the rocks of Montenegro, are ready now, as they have ever been during the four hundred years of their exile from their fertile plain, to meet the Turk at any odds for the re-establishment of justice and of peace in those countries. Another portion still, the five millions of Bulgarians cowed and beaten down to the ground, hardly venturing to look upwards, even to their Father in heaven, have extended their hands to you, they have sent you their petition, they have prayed for your help and protection. They have told you that they do not want alliance with Russia or with any foreign power, but that they want to be delivered from an intolerable burden of woe and shame. That burden of woe and shame—the greatest that exists on God's earth—is one that we thought united Europe was about to remove, that in the Protocol united Europe was pledged to remove, but which for the present you seem to have no efficacious means of contributing to the removal of. But, sir, the removal of that load of woe and shame is a great and noble prize. It is a prize well worth competing for. It is not yet too late to try to win it. I believe there are men in the Cabinet who would try to win it. It is not yet too late, I say, to become competitors for that prize; but be assured that whether you mean to claim for yourselves a part of the

crown of fame which will be the reward of true labour in that cause, or whether you turn your backs upon that cause and your own duty, I believe, for one, that the knell of Turkish tyranny in those provinces has sounded. It is about to be destroyed, perhaps not in the way or by the means that we should choose; but come the boon from what hands it may, I believe it will be gladly accepted by Christendom and by the world."

MR. GLADSTONE ON RUSSIAN DEEDS IN TURKISTAN.

AN outcry being raised against Russia for alleged atrocities in Asia, I subjoin the following:—

1. After the taking of Khiva, and the conclusion with the Khan of the new arrangements, owing to the restless ambition of the officers, General Kauffmann intimated to the Yomud Turkomans, on the 17th of July, 1873, that out of the war indemnity to be paid they must find 300,000 roubles, or £41,000, in cash within nineteen days. This they promised after some hesitation. He detained as hostages twelve among the elders whom he had himself invited to Khiva to receive the announcement. He placed a force under General Golovatschef in close proximity to the Yomuds, and prescribed, by an order dated July 18, No. 1,167, of which Schuyler gives the translated words, that, if they assembled with a view to resistance, or even to leaving the country, they and their families should be completely destroyed, and their herds and property confiscated. General Golovatschef also said, "You are not to spare either sex or age; kill all of them." On the 31st General Kauffmann arrived at Ilyali. At this time "the butchery and destruction by the troops had been so great" (of this no details are given beyond the burning of villages along the road) "that the Turkomans showed signs of yielding." It was agreed to take half the amount in camels; for the other half (of 310,000 roubles) the women had to sell their ornaments at forced prices* in the Russian camp. The time had been extended to August 14. On that day only one-third of the sum had been paid, and the troops proceeded to act upon their orders. The numbers

* MacGahan, however, says that they were taken by Kauffmann's order at twenty-five roubles to the pound of silver.

of the tribe, the amount of execution, are nowhere stated; but the Cossacks cut down everybody, "seemed to get quite furious," and "cut down everybody, whether small child or old man." This was on August 19. The Turkomans, in their irregular manner, availing themselves of every covert, resisted bravely, but in vain. Schuyler, in this part of his statement, quotes the statement made to him by a Russian eye-witness, Mr. Gromoff (ii. 359), who saw several such cases; saw one dead woman, one dead and one wounded child; and relates, on two later days, when the Turkomans had attacked and been repulsed—

"We burned, as we had done before, grain, houses, and everything which we met; and the cavalry, which was in advance, cut down every person, man, woman, or child. . . . They were generally women and children whom we met. I saw much cruelty" (ii. 361).

2. My next duty is to give the most material allegations of fact in reply from the paper of "A Russian." He states:—

a. That this campaign of eleven days was one of most severe and desperate fighting against formidable warriors: the General (Golovatschef), and nearly all his staff, were wounded, Prince Leuchtenberg twice barely escaping death. The Russians, he appears to convey, were enormously outnumbered.

This statement as to the character of the campaign is not inconsistent with, but is in some degree supported by, Schuyler's narrative. "A Russian" also refers largely to MacGahan's "Campaigning on the Oxus."*

b. That in the movement of these military nomads, the wives and children were mixed with the men, and often in the midst of the mortal struggle. "The French in suppressing the Commune certainly killed a much larger number of women and children than in that Turkoman campaign." But some were slain unavoidably and inadvertently.

c. That all the Turkomans except the Bagram Shali (Schuyler uses the name of Yomuds) were left unmolested by the expedition.

d. That after a bloody battle near the Uzbeg village of Ilyali, in

* Sampson Low. London, 1874.

which the Russians suffered severely, the Uzbeg inhabitants were not molested (MacGahan, p. 392).

e. That on the submission of the Turkomans, all operations ceased; that the wounded and prisoners were well cared for.

f. Noticing some positive errors of date in Schuyler's account of Gromoff's statement, he thinks there are probably errors of fact also. The statement is not endorsed by Gromoff.

g. "A Russian" relies implicitly on the evidence of MacGahan, as an impartial American who actually went through the operations of the campaign. He is quoted (pp. 363—365) to the effect that, himself present in the action of the first day, he saw the Cossacks pass by a group of twenty or thirty women and children. One left the ranks, and aimed his piece at them; but it missed fire, when MacGahan himself struck him across the face with his riding-whip, and ordered him back to his place.* The man obeyed: and with this exception "there was no violence offered to women and children." But he saw a young Cossack officer punish one of his men with his sword for "having tried to kill a woman." The apologist does not believe that there was or could have been such an order as that ascribed by Schuyler in his translation to Kauffmann; and he points out that the destruction of property, not of life, was the true way of striking an effectual blow at the refractory tribe.

h. He questions upon grounds which he sets forth, the soundness of Schuyler's translations, and thus the genuineness of the citations. I may add that the later battle, one of great severity, is described in MacGahan, chap. x. He tells of women cowering in silent dread—"They expected to be treated as they knew their own husbands, brothers, and lovers would have treated the vanquished under like circumstances" (p. 399); of a woman holding her dying husband's head; of children sitting in the baggage carts, or crying, or crawling about among the wheels; of a child laughing at General Golovatschef's banner; of an old woman wounded in the neck, "but she might easily have been taken for a man, as she wore no turban. . . . .

* It is, perhaps, fair to give the counterpart to this truth. "It was curious to see a Cossack stop from his work of plunder to give a child a piece of bread or a drink of water from his flask, in the gentlest manner possible, and then resume his occupation" (p. 406).

This was the only woman I saw wounded, though I was told there were three or four other cases." He mentions, however, in p. 400, another woman, "with bleeding face," seen by himself.

MacGahan's account of the orders given is in conflict with Schuyler's. The orders were to "give the *men* no quarter, whether they resisted or not" (p. 401). On the other side, he tells of a Russian picket of six, probably surprised by the Turkomans, and all found naked and headless (p. 376). In p. 400 we have a general summing up:—

"I must say, however, that cases of violence towards women were very rare; and although the Russians here were fighting barbarians, who commit all sorts of atrocities upon their prisoners, which fact might have excused a good deal of cruelty on the part of the soldiers, their conduct was *infinitely better than that of European troops in European battles.*"*

3. I have next to set forth the representation of the case as it was given in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 5, in its leading article, under the head of Russian Atrocity. Atrocity, when imputed to Russia, of course did not require the inverted commas, which in the case of the Bulgarian acts had been boldly used for denoting disbelief. In this leading article, the proof is at once treated as complete. With this promptitude we may compare the reserve maintained on the "sentimental" side, which for weeks and weeks declined to assume the truth of the reports from Bulgaria, until official attestation had been obtained, the accusation made known to the parties, and ample time for contradiction allowed.

It was boldly asserted that the proceedings offered "an almost exact parallel to the Turkish atrocities;" "differing *only* from them in some circumstances which make them less excusable."

Let us see what these circumstances of difference are.

(1) "The tribes" (Schuyler mentions a tribe, the Yomuds) were "virtually independent communities, which had sometimes submitted to intermittent control from the Khan of Khiva." They were nomad subjects of the Khan, ranging over parts of his dominions

* MacGahan, humanely carrying off a little girl, meets an officer of the staff doing the same, and makes the remark, "The Yomuds seem to have abandoned their girls with less reluctance than their boys" (*Cf.* pp. 403—411).

included in his treaties, constantly interfering in his government, and independent only in the sense in which Donald Bean Lean (see "Waverley") and his Highlanders, 120 years ago, were virtually independent of the King of England.

(2) These Turkomans had "given no special offence." It may be hard to say what is a "special offence" on the part of a race whose common non-special occupation is that of pillage and slave-dealing, with the murders attendant upon them. In the very account from which the *Pall Mall Gazette* was quoting is given a specimen of conduct which deserves notice:—

"There were a large number of Persian slaves in Khiva. On taking the town the Russians declared slavery at an end. The Persians were to be sent back to their country [Schuyler, ii. 353] in parties of five or six hundred. They desired to go by Mashad, but the route by Krasnovodeh was preferred, *that they might escape the Turkomans.* Two parties were sent accordingly by this safe route. One of them was attacked by the Turkomans, and the Persians either killed or reenslaved" (*ii.* 364).

The special offence, as towards the Russians, seems to have been that, while the Turkomans were the bravest and most truthful, they were also the fiercest and most intractable of the inhabitants of Khiva; that they alone offered the Russians a keen resistance; and that, rightly or wrongly, a measure of great severity against the largest of their tribes was judged to be indispensable for the establishment of anything like peace or order in the country. According to MacGahan, these Yomuds, from what he learned after his arrival in Europe, fell upon their Uzbeg neighbours, and pillaged them, by way of compensation for their losses from the Russians (p. 410).

(3) General Kauffmann, says the journal, issued his orders.

"Here they are. 'I order you immediately to move on the settlements of the Yomuds . . . and to give over the settlements of the Yomuds and their families to complete destruction, and their herds and property to confiscation.'"

This is *part* of a sentence; the commencement, which is omitted, completes the sense by supplying the condition. Before the words just extracted come these words (ii. 357): "If your Excellency sees that the Yomuds are not occupying themselves with getting

together money, *but are assembling for the purpose of opposing our troops*, or perhaps even for leaving the country, I order you," and so forth. It seems to have been thought well to represent the Turkomans as an innocent, unresisting race; and for this purpose a conditional order is turned into one without conditions.

(4) Certainly the officers (Schuyler, ii. 355) praised the Turkomans for honesty and straightforwardness; and they had been kind and hospitable to certain Russian exploring parties (*ibid.*); and so had all the inhabitants (ii. 354). But it is the cheerful submission of to-day, followed by the deadly assault of to-morrow, that constitutes one of the greatest difficulties of a position like that of the Russians among these Asiatic tribes. That these wild piratical tribes were trustworthy in their ordinary dealings is quite possible. Schuyler does not give his authority for these statements, but I do not doubt them.

(5) It does not so greatly touch the conduct of General Kauffmann, but as regards the Russian Government and people, an impartial observer might take note that the responsibility is not quite the same for what was done in a land of railways, at less than 200 miles from the capital, to a peasantry foreign to the ordinary use of arms, and one of the most pacific in the world, but stirred by long and incurable oppression, and for what was done to a tribe of robbers, at ten times the distance, in the heart of the Asiatic deserts, with the channels of information slow, and the central power of administration wholly without share in the particular transaction.

(6) It is very strange that this newspaper-writer should fail to notice that the climax of Turkish iniquity in Bulgaria does not lie in mere slaughter; but in the combination, without protest or resistance from any, of widespread destruction of life with exquisite refinements of torture, and with the wholesale indulgence of fierce and utterly bestial lusts. We can hardly conceive that these features of the case, which raise or sink it from the human to the diabolical, are absolutely of *no* account in the view of the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

We seem, then, to have before us, first, as well established, an unsparing slaughter in hard-fought action of the brave warriors of a marauding tribe, down to the time of their submission. I am

not able to say whether this was necessary or not. MacGahan seems to have thought the measure ill-advised, if not more. But I hold that we English are not in a condition to condemn it, either as a Bulgarian atrocity or as any other, unless upon the principle—too often, I am sorry to say, tolerated—that there is to be one rule for us, and another for other nations. I will here refer only to the slaughter of the Dyaks in their boats, less than thirty years ago, by Rajah Brooke and a British naval force. They were pirates; but they offered (I speak from memory) no resistance. They had no alternative of submission offered. The case was discussed in England and in Parliament, and the conduct of Rajah Brooke was approved by the majority. Lord Herbert and Mr. Hume were among the small number who condemned it.

Secondly, we have alleged orders of General Kauffmann, conditional, it is true, but, as set out by Schuyler, commanding the extermination of the women and children, as well as the men, of the marauding tribe. It cannot, I hope, be long before we know incontrovertibly whether this order has been correctly understood and given by Schuyler. If so, it can find no apologist here; but the mere issue of it, whether executed or not, will stand, though as a perfectly isolated, yet as a brutal and shameful act, deserving, as was well said in the *Daily News*, every censure except that bestowed on, and so richly due to, the Turkish proceedings in Bulgaria, and the Government which rewarded their authors.

Thirdly, as to the fact whether the women and children were slaughtered or were spared. We have here a distinct and singular conflict of evidence. Schuyler, founding himself on the verbal statement of Gromoff, a Russian eye-witness, which he took down "from his lips" (p. 359), affirms it. MacGahan, the friend of Schuyler, trusted by him, and himself an eye-witness on foot and horseback of the whole campaign, not less distinctly denies it, and affirms that the conduct of the Russian soldiery, under most trying circumstances, was "infinitely better than that of European* troops in European battles."

* The Cossacks engaged in these actions appear to have been Cossacks of the Kirghiz country, distinct from and (Schuyler, ii. 232) inferior to the well-known Cossacks of the Ural and the Don.

On every ground we must hope that this contradiction will be cleared up. As between the two, I cannot but think the testimony in MacGahan, who *is* an eye-witness, and writes in very full detail, preferable to that of Schuyler, who only reports one, and gives us a rough, hasty sketch; and also because it has been much longer before the world. I can charge no unfairness upon others who may think otherwise. But what are we to say of the enlightened anti-sentimental newspaper which gives and exaggerates the statement in Schuyler, and passes without notice, in its judicial work, the evidence of MacGahan, long ago set before the world?

But fourthly, and lastly, the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* did more: he suppressed and garbled evidence material to the case from the very book, the very pages, he professed to quote. Of this we have already seen something; but not nearly all.

a. He suppresses the case of Kuldja. This town was occupied by the Russians after a campaign of eleven days, with two battles. Before the entry into the city one of the tribes in Kuldja, exasperated at the surrender of the Sultan, massacred more than 2,000 of the others. The Russians entered; and here is the account of their conduct, reported by a Chinese agent to his Emperor:—

"The Dzian-Dziun* of Semiretch quieted in every way those who remained in Suidun, both Mantchoos and Chinese, both soldiery and civilians, as well as the Chinese Mussulmans, not harming anyone; not even a single blade of grass, nor a single tree; not a fowl, nor a dog received any harm or injury; not a hair was touched. All this is owing to the orders of the Dzian-Dziun of Semiretch. . ."

And again at the close—

"The leader of the Great Russian Empire, the Dzian-Dziun of Semiretch, with his army, inspired with humanity and truth, has quieted everyone. This petty foreign power saved the nation from fire and water; it subdued the whole four countries without the least harm, so that children are not frightened, and the people submitted not without delight and ecstasy" (ii. 186—188).

b. In the opening of the article of October 5, I find this passage—

"In the early part of his work on Turkistan, he (Schuyler) expressly compliments the Russians on their humanity in Central Asia, *probably then not knowing what stories he should have to tell before he had done.*"

* General Kolpakofsky.

This is a garbling which simply amounts to falsification. It means, if it means anything, that Schuyler's compliment refers to the early part of his experience, and could not have been given when it was completed; as if the work were a journal in which the remarks are to be taken with respect to the date at which they are given. It is nothing of the sort. The passage occurs in connection with the capture of Tashkent. It will be found in vol. i., p. 75:—

"It is said that the bazaar was sacked, and many of the inhabitants massacred. If so, this was an exceptional case; for *the Russian movements in Central Asia have been marked by great discipline and humanity.*"*

The writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* had evidently read the passage, of which he gives an account (without a reference) that it would be weakness to call anything but dishonest. It has nothing to do with earlier or later experience. At Tashkent, he had no experience at all, for his visit was some nine years after the capture; and he takes occasion, from a rumour he heard there, to give a general judgment on the operations of the Russians in direct contradiction to the charges which the *Pall Mall Gazette* has to make, and in complete accordance with the testimony of MacGahan.† Hence the passage had to be let alone or falsified; and the latter of the two was chosen.

c. Even yet I have to give another instance of this editor's wonderful faculty of suppressing evidence:—

In vol. ii., p. 354, on the page containing the commencement of the Turkoman narrative which he quotes, we find the account of the massacre of the Persians, which he suppresses; and in pp. 352, 353,

* I ought, perhaps, to state that I have read the whole of Schuyler's book, and that I am not aware of any passage in it, apart from what is treated in this article, which can in any way impugn this strong and general commendation.

† A week later, in a review of Schuyler's book—in the literary, not the political department of the paper (written as a literary and not a political article)—it is stated that "in some instances" we have "ample evidence" from his book that "the Russians have not always pursued a barbarous or heartless policy." This is a little better, if it be not indeed a little worse—as providing a sort of quotable passage in defence of any accusation of disingenuousness—a passage, be it observed, however, late enough not to interfere with the effect of the previous falsification, for which no sort or kind of apology is made.

the account of the capture of Khiva and the fearfully severe discipline enforced on the Russian soldiery:—

"These arrangements being made, General Kauffmann declared to the population of the Khanate the mercy of the Emperor, on condition that they should live quietly and peaceably, and occupy themselves with their business and with agricultural labour. . . Strict orders were given at the same time to the soldiers to send out no foraging parties, and to take nothing from the inhabitants, but to pay cash for everything at the bazaars. . . . In one case a soldier was sentenced to be hung for stealing a cow. The evidence of the native accuser had been accepted without other proof, and he was only able to escape because his comrades and the officers of his company proved that the cow had followed the company ever since crossing the Amir Darya. At another time, six soldiers were sentenced to be shot; but these severities were exercising such discontent among the troops, officers as well as soldiers, that at the personal request of the two Grand Dukes the men were pardoned."

On what principle of justice, charity, or decency is General Kauffmann to be deprived of the benefit of this remarkable testimony? But the introduction of this passage immediately preceding would have sadly marred the telling and needful parallel between Khiva and Bulgaria, and this, too, was suppressed accordingly.

Such is the "information" supplied, at this epoch of blazing light, in a most great and solemn cause, to millionaire drawing-rooms, to the loungers in arm-chairs at clubs, to Tory members of Parliament,* greedy for something to say to constituencies but recently astounded by the discovery of a huge iniquity, too long kept back from them; and this by a journal which in the faintest perfume of humanity smells a dangerous fanaticism. But what means are not sanctified by their end, when the purpose is, not indeed to whitewash Islam in Bulgaria, for that is now despaired of, but to do the next best thing, namely, to black-wash the country which is its historical antagonist?

* See, for example, the speech of Sir Thomas Bateson, M.P., a few days ago, at Belfast; and the speech of Mr. Hanbury, M.P., at Hanley. "Mr. Schuyler went also into Central Asia with the Russian Army, and he narrated how precisely the same atrocities had been committed by the Russians in Central Asia."—*Staffordshire Daily Sentinel*, October 18, 1876. The sentences would be correct if the word "not" were inserted in each of them. It is truly a royal road to learning, when research begins and ends with the leading article of a newspaper.

To expose cruelty is good: but there are other things besides cruelty which ought to be exposed, and among these is the deliberate fraud of a trusted or, in his own chosen phrase, a responsible* adviser. Untruth, even when used for beneficial ends, is bad and base. It is here used for no good end. It is not meant to draw forth tears for Turkomans, not undeserving of them, though in some respects they be. It is meant to sow strife, with the risk of bloodshed; and the end in view, and the means employed, are worthy of one another.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

* *Pall Mall Gazette*, October 23, p. 9: "Immunity in Politics."

MR. BRIGHT ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

YET, considering our vast interests and our vast peril, there is always—at least, so far as my recollection goes—a war party in this country. There is a war party in the press. Unfortunately for the public interest, there is hardly anything which tends so much to enhance the profits of the proprietors of newspapers as a stirring and exciting conflict. We have a war party in Parliament. There are always men who sit there, and though the great majority sit upon the side opposite to that which I sit, still there are, unhappily, a few upon our side who, if we look to their conduct, are not strongly in favour of peace.

In 1870 there was a war between Prussia and France. You know the result was that France was vanquished and that Prussia became Germany. There were persons then who advised that we should take sides. Some said, "There is great danger to ourselves." Some said one thing and some another, and eminent men said, "If you are in favour of peace, as England would be, you should declare war against that Power by whom war is declared—that is, if France declares war against Prussia, you should support Prussia in the interests of peace, and declare war against France; if Prussia should declare war against France, then you should join France in the interests of peace, and make war against Prussia."

Well now, in these cases, you see that war was avoided, that we escaped its penalties, and I would ask you now, is there one single man in the United Kingdom outside Bedlam—and I doubt if there be one inside it—who regrets the course of neutrality which the people and the Government of the United Kingdom pursued? But

there was one case in which we took a different course, and that was the case of the war between Russia and Turkey in 1853. Turkey declared war against Russia, and after advising the Turk to accept a proposition of mediation and arbitration, which the Turk refused, and which Russia accepted, we took sides with Turkey, notwithstanding, and entered into a sanguinary conflict with Russia. Now, if in 1853 we had advised the Porte to make the concession urged upon it by Russia, which was only to strengthen the hands of Russia in defence of the Christian subjects of Turkey, Turkey would have avoided that war which was the forerunner, it may be, of its destruction. We should have avoided the contest into which we entered; three-quarters of a million of men, according to Mr. Kinglake (more, I think, he puts it at) would have been saved from slaughter and death by toil and neglect and disease; millions—I know not how much, perhaps two or three hundred millions—of treasure would not have been wasted; and in all probability we should have avoided the vast increase of the armaments of the Continent which was made after that war and as an immediate consequence of it, and some of the many subsequent wars that have disturbed the peace of Europe. I remember a line that Milton wrote. In one of his grand sonnets he says,

"For what can war but needless wars still breed

and that war has bred indescribable loss and suffering to several of the nations of Europe. But the war party is always jealous of somebody; it always hates somebody. Forty years ago it was jealous of Russia; and at that time to such an extent were the people afraid of Russia that they believed that we in the North of England, especially on the eastern coast of Yorkshire, were in danger of an invasion from the Baltic. Now, we know that that would have been a game that would have established the lunacy of any man who sent out a fleet with such a purpose; and yet, under that sort of panic, the Government of that time added 5,000 men to the English navy, and then the public began to think that after all perhaps they might be safe.

I am sorry to say that the course pursued by England, represented by Her Majesty's Government, made European concert all

but impossible. It may be thought reasonable that, if we were not willing to enforce the verdict arrived at, we might, at any rate, have stood aside and left Turkey to her fate. Russia has undertaken to enforce that verdict. Now, I have not anything to say in defence of Russia except this, that if the Conference was wise, and the negotiations were a joint interference, it seems to me to be only in accordance with reason and logic that somebody should enforce the verdict. Russia on the borders of Turkey suffers more, of course, than we do from the disturbances in Turkish provinces, and the people of Russia have got sympathy with the Christian population of Turkey; that sympathy exercises a great influence on the Russian Government, which, therefore, steps forward, in accordance with the conduct of nations, as we find it in all the histories, to defend that Christian population and to put down evils, disturbances, and oppression which had become intolerable in the eyes of Europe. We might have supposed that our Government would be entirely neutral, but its neutrality is not exactly of the kind which I think it ought to have shown. For example, we say to Russia, "You must not touch Egypt"; but Egypt is at war with Russia, because Egypt is constantly sending ships of war and troopships and soldiers to the Sultan. Russia, sensibly enough, not anxious to come in contact with England, pledges herself that Egypt shall be kept outside of the military operations in which she is engaged. We say further, at least many people say—I am not sure whether the Government have said it in express language, but people believe they mean it—that Russia shall not approach Constantinople; but if Russia is not to approach Constantinople, what is that but to prolong the war?—to give Turkey an inducement not to make peace, and to shut out Russia from one of the commonest rights of the victor; for surely to attack the capital city of an empire or kingdom at war, and to occupy it, is the speediest mode of bringing that war to a conclusion. Our Government now appears to hold as far as it can the doctrine and the policy of 1854; it adheres to what has been called the ghostly phantom of the balance of power. That balance of power is a curious shadowy thing which has been served for much evil. In 1830 the French, under Charles X., captured Algiers, and made themselves possessors of a large tract on the northern

shores of the Mediterranean. At that time it was said that France was making the Mediterranean into a French lake, and was disturbing the balance of power. Happily we did not go to war for it. Ten days after the capture of Algiers, the King of the French—King of France, as he called himself—was a refugee on the shores of this island, and from that time to this has Algeria been a costly burden to the French people. I do not doubt that in forty-seven years since that transaction France has spent 100 millions of money as the result of its possession of Algeria, and it would be a small estimate to say that it has cost them more than a hundred thousand French lives, and France is not a bit stronger to-day and the balance of power is not in the smallest degree disturbed by the conquest of Algeria by France. Russia has over and over again proclaimed in every form of word, by every kind of solemnity of expression, that it is not their intention even to attempt to hold Constantinople. Then there comes the question of opening the Straits, and you hear continually the word Bosphorus. The Straits are open to the trade of all nations, and were opened by the Russians themselves a hundred years ago, after they had been closed to the new commerce of the world during 300 years of their possession by the Turks. Now, I hold the opening of the Straits to be absolutely inevitable, but under conditions which the Powers of Europe could find no difficulty in arranging. But there is no reason to suppose that Russia, any more than France, would interfere with the Canal. There is no country in Europe that until these vile suspicions were aroused was more disposed to a perpetual amity with England than the country of Russia.

One more observation on this: I said that those Straits pass through Turkish territory; and that you might make provision that not more than one ship or two ships, or whatever limited number was thought proper, should be at one time in the Straits between the two seas, and therefore the possessors of Constantinople, whether the Turks or the Greeks, would be free from menace and bombardment from any fleet passing down the channel. But surely the Straits, which the Creator of the world made for the traffic and service of the world, have as good a right to be open to the world as the canal which was made by M. Lesseps with the money of his French shareholders. It seems to

me only the other day that I heard Lord Palmerston, when he was Prime Minister in the House of Commons, declare that this Suez Canal was a chimera—that it was a sort of thing that could not be made; that it could not succeed if it were made; that it would be no advantage to England; that England should have nothing to do with it; and that none of its money should be spent upon it. Well the result was that it was all thrown upon France, and France, stimulated by the hostility of the English Minister, brought forth its money in vast sums; and under the wonderful energy of M. Lesseps the Canal was made, and not only made, but succeeds, and will pay. Well, I believe also that the other nations would be quite willing to see the Straits between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean just as freely open. They have no kind of interest such as we pretend to have. Our interests are, to my mind, purely visionary. Russia is not a nation, nor likely to be for a long time a nation that will have great fleets to traverse the Mediterranean as we have, and if she had a fleet there it would be no more hostile to us than the new created and growing fleet of Italy, or the now existing and formidable one of France; and when I come to consider the position of Russia, shut up as she is in the north, in the Baltic by the frost, her only entrance by the Sound, which is narrow, that she has no great navigable rivers running into the ocean—I say it is one of the most unjust ideas, and one of the very wildest and unstatesmanlike notions, that this country can perpetually forbid a nation of eighty millions of people to obtain that access to the main ocean which the Creator of the world made equally for all his people upon the globe.

A year and a half ago, I suppose now, they astonished the country by the announcement that they had become the possessors of a large number of shares in the Suez Canal. They gave twice as much for them as it was said the Khedive had offered them for in another quarter. But I am not objecting to a couple of millions here or there.

Well, Lord Salisbury was endeavouring by all the means in his power to urge the Turk to make those most moderate concessions which at the time of the conference only demanded that with which Russia would have been content and the war would have been avoided; but the war party in this country, the war press, the war public men, and that portion of the public which I call the rowdy war party—there are

rowdies among the rich as well as among the poor—all that party were speaking with another voice, and stimulating and encouraging the Turk to resist, thus bringing Turkey to the catastrophe in which she now finds herself.

I was talking the other day to a Frenchman, a very eminent Frenchman, who, in all probability, when there is another Liberal Government in France—which I hope may be soon—will form an important member of it. We had been talking about Egypt and upon the language which was held by some people in this country with regard to it. I said to him, "What would be thought in France if England were, under any pretence and by any means, whether by force or by purchase, or in any way, to obtain possession of Egypt?" He said he thought it would create the very worst impression in that country, and his opinion was, that no Government could maintain itself in France which permitted such a measure without the strongest protest and remonstrance; and whether protest and remonstrance would be all it was not very easy to determine.

Now, in this discord with regard to what should be done, there is one other consideration of great importance, and that is, that England has no allies. I believe there is no country in Europe at this moment, no other country, that feels with us in reference to this question. We are alone in Europe, utterly, I believe, with reference to the Bosphorus, and with reference to any question of danger as connected with the closing of the Canal. Among other nations our demands are felt to be unreasonable and arrogant, and I confess I sometimes feel that we stand a risk of some European combination against us, and that we shall find ourselves not triumphant, but baffled. And when the final settlement comes of these questions, unless we can be moderate and just, I suspect there is great danger that we may suffer a humiliation which not the nation only as a whole, but which all of us individually may be made severely to feel.

I began by saying that we were a great Empire; it becomes a great State like this to set always to the world a great and noble example. I quote a passage from a recent speech of Lord Derby with a sentiment of the utmost admiration and the fullest concurrence. He says "We must always remember that the greatest of British interests is the interests of peace." Let us believe, whether it be the United

States on the other side of the Atlantic, or whether it be the great empire of Russia in the east of Europe, that there are good and great and noble men in those countries; that there is no disposition whatsoever, as I believe there is none, to make quarrels with this country or to do evil of any kind to us. Great as our nation is and its dependencies in every quarter of the globe, great will be its influence for good; and, though the world moves but slowly—far too slowly, for our ardent hopes—to its brighter day, history will declare with an impartial voice that Britain, clearing off her ancient errors, led the grand procession of the nations in the path of civilization and of peace.

EXTRACT FROM WALLACE'S "RUSSIA."

MR. WALLACE, after passing six years in Russia, speaks of it as follows :—"The village Communes, containing about five-sixths of the population, are capital specimens of representative constitutional government of the extreme democratic type. No class of men in the world is more good-natured, pacific, and loyal than the Russian peasantry.

"The advocates of women's rights will be interested to hear that women who, on account of the absence or death of their husbands, happen to be for the moment heads of households, as such are entitled to be present in the village assembly, and their right to take part in the deliberations is never questioned. The decisions of the village assembly are therefore usually characterized by plain, practical, common sense. There are many villages in the Eastern provinces of European Russia which have been for many generations half Tartar and half Russian, and the amalgamation of the two nationalities has not yet begun; they live in perfect good fellowship; elect as village elder sometimes a Russian and sometimes a Tartar, and discuss the commercial affairs in the village assembly without reference to religious matters. I know one village where the good fellowship went even a step further: the Christians determined to repair their church, and the Mahometans helped them to transport wood for the purpose. It therefore is clear that while the Mussulmans rob, plunder, and massacre the Christians in Turkey, where they have the upper hand, and are armed, the Christians in Russia, who are the dominant race, treat their Mussulman fellow

subjects with the utmost kindness and respect, and that the Mahometans themselves are happier and better under Christian than Mussulman rule.

"In each Province there is an assembly called the Zemstvo. This assembly is composed partly of nobles and partly of peasants, the latter being decidedly in the majority, and no trace of antagonism seemed to exist between the two classes. Landed proprietors and their *ci-devant* serfs evidently met for the moment on a footing of equality. . . . . Instead of that violent antagonism which might have been expected there was a great deal too much unanimity. During the three weeks I was daily present at their deliberations. . . . . The Zemsvto of Novgorod's proceedings in the assembly of 1870 were conducted in a business-like satisfactory way. The Zemvsto is, however, a modern institution created about ten years ago; it fulfils tolerably well its ordinary every-day duties, and is very little tainted with peculation and jobbery. It has greatly improved the condition of the hospitals, asylums, and other benevolent institutions committed to its charge, and it has done much for the spread of popular education; it has created a new and more equitabe system of rating and a system of mutual fire insurance. Of all the countries in which I have travelled, Russia certainly bears off the palm in all that regards hospitality. All classes of the Russian people have a certain kindly apathetic good nature which makes them very charitable towards their neighbours. Russia advances in the path of progress by a series of unconnected frantic efforts, each of which is naturally followed by a period of temporary exhaustion. The Russian noblesse has little or nothing of what we call aristocratic feeling; little or nothing of that haughty domineering exclusive spirit which we are accustomed to associate with the word aristocracy . . . . we can scarcely ever find a Russian who is proud of his birth, or imagines that the fact of his having a long pedigree gives him any right to political privileges or social consideration. The son of a small proprietor, or even of a parish priest, may rise to the highest offices of state, whilst the descendant of the half mythical

Rurik may descend to the rank of peasants. It is said that not long ago a certain Prince Krapota gained his living as a cabman in St. Petersburg. There are hundreds of princes and princesses who have not the right to appear at Court, and who would not be admitted into what is called St. Petersburg society, or indeed into refined society in any country; there are 652,887 hereditary nobles in Russia, and 374,367 personal nobles, together 1,027,254. Between the nobles, the clergy, the burghers, and the peasants there are no distinctions of race and no impassable barriers.

"The Crimean and other Tartars used to make raids into Russia and Poland, and up to 1783, when the Crimea was conquered and annexed to Russia, large numbers of Russian men, women, and children were sold as slaves in Constantinople, and to the Persians, Arabs, and Syrians. When they have valuable boys and girls they first fatten them, clothe them in silk, and put powder and rouge on their cheeks.

"The experiment of Jewish colonies has failed, their houses are in a most dilapitated condition, and their villages remind one of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet.

"The Slavophiles seem to favour the idea of a grand Slavonic confederation, in which the hegemony would belong to Russia.

"The Emperor Alexander is of a kind-hearted, humane disposition, singularly free from military ambition; he has a goodly portion of sober common sense, a limited confidence in his own judgment, and a consciousness of enormous responsibility.

"To protect an open frontier against the incursions of nomadic tribes three methods are possible, the construction of a great wall, the establishment of a strong military cordon, and the permanent subjugation of the marauders. The first of these expedients, adopted by the Romans in Britain and by the Chinese on their north-western frontier, is enormously expensive, and utterly impossible in a country like Russia; the second was constantly tried and found wanting; the third is alone practicable and efficient. Though the Government has long since recognised that the acquisition of barren thinly populated steppes is a

burden rather than an advantage, it has been compelled to go on making annexations for the purpose of self defence.

"Russia has on four occasions since Peter the Great ceded territory. To Persia she ceded in 1729 Mazanderan and Arkabad; and in 1735 a large part of the Caucasus. In 1856, by the Treaty of Paris, she gave up the mouth of the Danube and part of Bessarabia; and in 1867 she sold to the United States her American possessions. To these ought perhaps to be added the strip of territory which she lately conquered from the Khivans and handed over to Bokhara, and, Kuldja which she ceded to the Chinese.

"Certain it is that the Russian peasantry have reason to congratulate themselves that they were emancipated by a Russian autocrat, and not by a British House of Commons; and it is equally certain that in some of the annexed provinces the lower classes enjoy advantages which they would not possess under British rule. (This is the sentiment to which Mr. Arch gave utterance recently.) If the Khan of Khiva had conscientiously fulfilled his international obligations the expedition would not have been undertaken. Russia must push forward her frontier towards India until she reaches a government which is able and willing to keep order within its boundaries, and to prevent its subjects from committing depredations on their neighbours. As none of the petty states of Central Asia seem capable of permanently fulfilling this condition, it is pretty certain that the Russian and British frontiers will one day meet. As to the complications and disputes which inevitably arise between contiguous nations, I think they are fewer and less dangerous than those which arise between nations separated from each other by a small state which is incapable of making its neutrality respected, and is kept alive simply by the jealousy of rival powers. Germany does not periodically go to war with Holland or Russia, though separated from them by a mere artificial frontier, whilst France and Austria have never been prevented from going to war with each other by the broad intervening territory.

"As to the Slavonic Committee, whatever it did it did openly.

Detailed reports of its proceedings were largely circulated in Russia, and freely given to foreigners.

"Tchernayeff has made for himself the reputation, by his campaigns in Central Asia, of a brave, able soldier, and an honest patriotic man. I must say that I know no body of men who are more sensitive to humanitarian conceptions than the Russian educated class. Probably about 4,000 Russian volunteers went to Servia.

"Russian autocracy, founded on the unbounded hereditary devotion of the people, peasantry and nobles alike, cannot for a moment be compared with French autocracy in the time of Napoleon III.

"Again and again whilst observing Russia's policy towards the Servians and Montenegrins, I have been reminded of the anecdote about the French revolutionary leader, who, before advancing to a barricade, pointed to the crowd and whispered confidentially to a friend, '*Il faut bien les suivre, je suis leur chef.*'"

As to the cleanliness of the Russian peasants, Mr. Wallace tells us that they take a weekly vapour bath, which cannot be said of the peasantry of any other country in the world, including our "great unwashed;" and he further says, "I encountered peasants who had a small collection of books, and twice I found in such collections, much to my astonishment, a Russian translation of 'Buckles' History of Civilization.'" Now, if all Europe were ransacked, it is doubtful if two other peasants could be found who possessed a book of the same calibre.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. FREEMAN'S "OTTOMAN POWER IN EUROPE."

"It is a fact well worthy of remembrance, that both the Bulgarians and, somewhat later, the Russians, when they became dissatisfied with their own heathen religion, had Mahometanism and Christianity both set before them, and that they deliberately chose Christianity. . . . The Christian subject of the Turkish Government does not wish to reform the Turkish Government; he does not wish to reconstruct it after the model of some other Government; he simply wishes to get rid of it altogether. . . . The Bosnian Christian looks upon the Servian or Montenegrin as his countryman; he looks on the Turk as a foreigner. Christianity has got rid of the two great evils of polygamy and slavery. Mahometanism cannot get rid of them, because they are allowed and consecrated by the Mahometan law. There are at this day vast nations of Turks, some of them mere savages, who have never embraced Mahometanism. . . . It was the increase of wrongdoing of the Turks, both towards the native Christians and towards the pilgrims from the West, which caused the cry for help that led to the Crusades. There were no Crusades as long as the Saracens ruled; as soon as the Turks came in the Crusades began.

"Othman bears a high character among Turkish rulers, yet he murdered his uncle simply for dissuading him from a dangerous enterprise. . . . Orkhan first demanded a tribute of children. The deepest of wrongs which other tyrants did as an occasional

outrage thus became under the Ottomans a settled law. A fixed proportion of the strongest and most promising boys among the conquered Christian nations were carried off for the service of the Ottoman princes, and were brought up in the Mahometan faith, and in this way the strength of the conquered nations was turned against themselves. They could not throw off the yoke, because those among them who were their natural leaders were pressed into the service of their enemies. It was not till the practice of levying the tribute on children was left off that the conquered nations showed any power to stir. While the Ottoman power was strongest, the chief posts of the Empire, civil and military, were constantly held not by native Turks, but by Christian renegades of all nations, and the flower of the army were the janissaries formed of tribute children.

"The Turks were able to use each people that they brought under their power as helpers against the next people whom they attacked. Thus at Kussova, Amurath had already Christian tributaries fighting on his side. From this time, till Servia was completely incorporated with the Turkish dominions, the Servians had to fight in the Turkish armies against the other Christian nations which the Turks attacked.

"The most remarkable conquest of Bajazet was in Asia. Philadelphia still held out, and its citizens still deemed themselves subjects of the Emperors at Constantinople. Yet, when Bajazet thought proper to add the city to his dominions, the Emperor Manuel and his son were forced, as tributaries of the Sultan, to send their contingent to the Turkish army, and to help in the conquest of their own city.

"Eubœa was conquered by the Turks in 1471, when the Venetian governor, Erizzo, who had stipulated for the safety of his head, had his body sawn asunder. . . . The last Bosnian king was promised his life, but he and his sons were put to death none the less. . . . Speaking roughly, the lower clergy throughout the conquered lands have always been patriotic leaders, while the bishops and other higher clergy have been slaves and instruments of the Turks. . . . In Albania

a large part of the country did become Mahometan, while other parts remained Christian, some tribes being Catholic and some Orthodox. . . .

"The Mufti Djemali, whose name deserves to be remembered, several times turned the Sultan from bloody purposes. At last he withstood Selim, when he wished to massacre all the Christians in his dominion, and to forbid the exercise of the Christian religion. , . .

"In the days of Sobieski and Eugene, men had not learned to talk about the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, or to think it a good thing for Christian nations to be held in Turkish bondage. They did not openly profess the doctrine that certain nations should be deprived of the rights of human beings for the sake of the supposed interests of some other nation.

"When Belgrade submitted in 1813, the Turks promised to put no man to death. Turk-like, they beheaded and impaled the men to whom they had promised their lives. Men still live who remember seeing their fathers writhing on the stakes before the citadel of Belgrade. . . .

"The Albanians generally, both Christian and Mahometan, have always kept up a strong national feeling. . . . They have always been discontented and often rebellious subjects of the Turks. . . . It is most important to remember that the rising (for independence) was in no way confined to the narrow bounds of that part of Greece which was set free in the end. The whole Greek nation rose in every part of the Turkish dominions where they had numbers and strength to use. They rose throughout Greece itself, in Epiros, Thessaly, and Macedonia, in Crete too, and Cyprus, and others of the islands. The Greek revolution was mainly the work of the Greeks themselves, counting among them the Christian Albanians.

"Ibrahim, who afterwards, like most tyrants, was honourably received in England, went on the deliberate principle of making the whole world a desert, by slaying or enslaving the whole Christian population.

"Prince Leopold, afterwards King of the Belgians, accepted the crown (of Greece), but he presently resigned it, because he saw that no Greek state would flourish which was pent up in such a narrow frontier.

"If we could fancy a state of things in which our English country was free, and the next country was under Turkish bondage, it is quite certain that the men of the free country would help their enslaved neighbours when they revolted . . . but then they ought to be called 'foreign intriguers' too, for there is no greater difference between the men of Montenegro and the men of Herzegovina, than there is between the men of Yorkshire and the men of Lancashire. . . .

"Some of these poor people (the Cretans) were carried off in safety to Greece in ships of several European nations, amongst others in the English ship 'Assurance.' . . . But the English Foreign Secretary, now Earl of Derby, forbade that any such act of humanity should be done again. It does not appear that any other European nation acted in the same way. England alone . . . must bear the shame of having in cold blood forbidden that old men and women, and children, and helpless persons of all kinds, should be saved from the jaws of the barbarians. No blacker page in the history of England, no blacker page in the history of human nature, can be found. . . . No treaty, no oath, can bind a man to commit a crime, nor can it bind him, when he has the power of hindering a crime, to allow it to be done.

"They (the alleged foreign intriguers in Turkey) are foreign intriguers in the same sense in which Sir Philip Sidney was a foreign intriguer when he died at Zutphen, for the freedom of the Netherlands. . . . As Englishmen then fought and died for the freedom of a kindred land, so now many men from Montenegro (from Austria), from Russia, and from Italy, too, fought and died the same glorious death for the freedom of the oppressed Slavonic land. . . . At a time when no Montenegro prisoner was ever spared by the Turks, but when Turkish prisoners, a Pasha among them, were living quite comfortably in Montenegro,

we were told of the horrible atrocities of the Montenegrins. . . . The old custom which the Montenegrins had learned of the Turks was to bring home the heads of slain enemies as trophies . . . but it is not now done by any troops who are under Montenegrin discipline. But the custom of cutting off the dead enemy's nose has still been sometimes kept up by the irregular insurgent band, and in one or two cases a man who was thought to be dead was wakened up by the loss of his nose. . . . After all, though to cut off a dead man's nose is a brutal thing, it is hardly so brutal as roasting, torturing, and impaling living people. . . .

"When Sir Henry Bulwer was Ambassador at Constantinople, a circular was sent to the British Consuls in the Turkish dominions, bidding them send in an account of the state of the country. Another letter went with the circular, bidding them to make their report as favourable as they could to the Turks. . . . He (Sir Henry) was to act as an honest man sent to *lie* abroad for the good of his country. . . . We look on, we count the cost, we see how the wrong-doer deals with his victim, and we determined to uphold the wrong-doer, because we think that to uphold him will suit some interest of our own. There is no question of national glory, no question of national honour, nothing which can stir up even a false enthusiasm. It is a calm mercantile calculation that the wrongs of millions of men will pay. The Turkish bully is at heart a coward. . . . A wanton murder of Mussulmans by Mussulmans has been known to go unpunished when Christian witnesses only could prove the fact.

"The Bosnian Beys, the descendants of renegades, still keeping up the old spite of the renegades, are described none the less as very lax votaries of Islam, as remembering their Christian descent, as treasuring up the patents of nobility which their forefathers received from the ancient Christian kings. Those who know them well think that if they were put under a Christian government, their re-conversion would not be hard, the Bey would easily slide back into the baron. . . . There is a mosque at Chalkis, and there is a mosque at Belgrade. The few Mahometans

at Chalkis suffer no wrong or disability. . . . When the Turkish garrison left Belgrade, the settled Mussulman population went also. But why did they go? Not by their own free-will—not by the will of the Servians, who wished them to stay. They went by orders from Constantinople, where the ruling powers wished to make out a case against Servia, as if Servia had driven them out. But the mosque is there still, and its minister is paid by the Servian state for his services towards any Mussulman remnant that may be left, or towards any Mussulman traveller that may pass by."

TRANSLATION OF COMTE SEEBACH'S "OPEN LETTER" TO LORD BEACONSFIELD, PUBLISHED IN THE *NORD*, OF BRUSSELS, ON 23RD JUNE, 1877.

"MANY years have elapsed, my lord, since I had the good fortune to make your acquaintance, and our paths having no longer crossed each other, I would fear to have become an unknown person to you if I was not certain that the circumstances—important for you as well as for me—in the midst of which we met must have preserved for me in your recollection the place which you have not ceased to occupy in mine.

"Our relations, it is true, have not survived the interests which had created them, but they lasted long enough to have obtained for me on your part proofs of esteem and of confidence to which I am happy to be able to pay even tardily my debt of gratitude in bringing you, my lord, by this open letter, an irrefutable testimony against the calumnies which impute to you the responsibility of the inundation with which Europe is now threatened.

"To this effect I have to evoke the recollection of a time already far from us, and to formulate summarily the political situation which then brought us together. It was, my lord, at that period of the Crimean War when a great storm was formed over the head of Lord Palmerston.

"In the course of the first winter campaign the most important London journal had unveiled the faults of the military organization of England with great patriotic courage, and rendered the Government responsible for the evil consequences of the indolence

which had left the third of the army to perish in physical sufferings past human endurance. At these heartrending revelations a great cry of stupor and indignation had resounded in the three kingdoms, from one end to the other, and it burst forth with all the more force when the bloody repulses undergone under the walls of Sebastopol placed the fear of a great disaster in the place of the hopes of peace which the prompt reconstitution of the army had caused to revive.

"All the political atmosphere was troubled by these cruel deceptions. On both sides of the Channel the ancient antagonism, which even blood shed in common and the intoxication of the first successes had not succeeded in entirely extinguishing, was rekindled. The distrust, which had never ceased to reign secretly in the camps, penetrated into the Governments; and the report having spread that the Emperor Napoleon would proceed to the theatre of war, all the English journals attributed to him more or less openly the intention to seek the occasion of a meeting with the sovereign of Russia to negotiate directly a peace to the detriment of the honour of England.

"The word treason was pronounced, and for the first time the mass of the country began to doubt the ability of the statesman to whom it had confided its destinies, and who, until then, had held the British lion in a leash whilst imprinting on his policy always and everywhere the seal of the brutal motto of the Romans. The proud sentiment of *Civis Romanus sum* being no longer allowable to the English nation, the popularity of Lord Palmerston was shaken at its base; and being chief—not in name, but in fact—of the Opposition, you were, my lord, justified in thinking that the moment for securing his succession was near. The ministerial combinations of your party had reserved to you without contest the direction of foreign affairs, which you did not then, however, know except by the newspapers, and you adopted then the resolution to go to Paris to draw from better sources, and to ascertain especially, yourself, the reality or the erroneousness of the apprehensions which the oscillations of French policy caused in England.

"A mutual friend, who had preceded you to explore the ground, made me aware of your projects, my lord, and as soon as you arrived you did me the honour to come and see me, and to place immediately our relations on the footing of intimacy in making me acquainted from the very first with all the phases of the political life of the 'Nobody' of former times, as it pleased you to call yourself, and in admitting to me afterwards, without reserve, that, being on the point of reaching the summit of the social ladder, you had to ask me for a service which would assist you to surround your name with a new glory.

"To be believed, on my word, that I have rendered you this service, of which the preliminaries were the frankness with which you expressed yourself towards me concerning the direction which you intended to impress on English policy, and which permits me to guarantee your real sentiments in the present crisis, it is necessary to define the situation which the war last made for me in Paris.

"Nominated Minister of Saxony in France, a short time before the disappearance of the Republic, after having filled during fifteen years the same functions at St. Petersburg, where I had become the son-in-law of the Chancellor of the Empire, Count Nesselrode, I had been received by the chief of the State with much good-will, which was due in part to private affairs which he had at heart, and also to the illusion that my family connections might be utilised in the difficulties which even then the French Government foresaw on the side of Russia at the moment when it would change in form.

"In both cases my duties prevented me from responding to the expectations of the Prince President, but I had been fortunate enough to be able to reconcile them with the wishes I formed at this time with the men of order in Europe for the consolidation of the Napoleonic dynasty, and the Emperor recollected this.

"Grateful by natural disposition—as no man ever was in a greater degree—he gave me credit for the attachment which I had shown for his person; and when the curtain rose in the East for the prologue of the great drama to which the struggle taking

place at this moment on the banks of the Danube will, perhaps, furnish the epilogue, the Emperor Napoleon gave me a great proof of regard by conducting me spontaneously into his study to have with me a distinct and clear explanation on the subject of the evident conflict between my official position and my well-known sympathies for the adversary that France was going to combat.

"Far from diminishing the confidence which, in the course of the negotiations which preceded the rupture, the Emperor had never ceased to testify towards me by confidential communications on his personal grievances against Russia, this conversation strengthened it, and left him the certainty that, whilst regretting profoundly his policy of the moment, I was, nevertheless, ready to serve him loyally, with the approbation of my sovereign as soon as it was modified.

. "In this order of ideas I had demanded and obtained authority from the French and Saxon Governments to accept the mission which the Cabinet of St. Petersburg wished to confide to me, to take under the protection of my legation the Russian subjects who remained in France; and the terms in which the Emperor expressly confirmed it verbally showed me clearly that he attached to it the same anticipations as myself.

"As I am not writing a chapter of my memoirs, I may dispense with enlarging on the ways and means which have realized them, by conducting gradually, in the midst of the clang of arms, and in spite of diplomacy, to a tacit reconciliation between the sovereigns of Russia and France. This reconciliation furnished, after the taking of Sebastopol, the basis of the confidential negotiations between the two Governments, from which arose the Conferences and the Peace of Paris.

"This reconciliation was still little advanced at the time when we met, my lord, but I was sufficiently aware of the dominant ideas at St. Petersburg to be able to assure you that the vague and adventurous policy of the Emperor Napoleon would never prevail there against that which you had decided to cause England to follow, as soon as you had taken the reins of Government.

"In your prepossessions, my lord, a very small place was reserved for the present time, of which you considered the difficulties as a Minister directing a great Empire aware of his personal superiority.

"Deeply convinced that the coalition into which England had allowed itself to be drawn placed it in the position of a dupe, you determined to dissolve it by concessions to the just exigencies of the adversary, which would hasten, if necessary, in spite of France, the conclusion of peace.

"All your glances were turned towards the future, which you judged with the clearness of the prophet kings of the Old Testament. In your eyes, my lord, Europe was of necessity condemned to be transformed by accident, by fire, and blood, if England and Russia did not come to an understanding on the leading features of their policy in the East, and you had no doubt of establishing this concord by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston.

"According to you, the vital interests of the two Governments enjoined on them to remain strictly united in Europe, as well as in Asia, in order to preserve to each the sphere of action agreed upon.

"The programme which you traced for yourself, determining distinctly its character and limits, and knowing it to be identical with that which the Emperor Nicholas and Count Nesselrode in his long and brilliant career had used all their efforts to establish, I was sure that the prospect of seeing it realised by your initiative, my lord, would become at St. Petersburg an element of peace. I transmitted it then at your express demand to the Chancellor, with the request to make his august master acquainted with it. Both hailed it as the certain promise of a new era of repose in Europe.

"Unfortunately the English people did not fulfil these hopes, and banished yours amongst those with which vanquished parties too often delude themselves. Lord Palmerston remained in power.

"I stop here, my lord, for I think I have attained the object of my letter.

"A statesman who has grown old in the management of great affairs may modify his views, but he cannot renounce the convictions of his whole life at the end of his career without being enlightened by experience. Now, since the period of which I have just spoken, all the events in the East have shown the correctness of the fundamental principle of the policy which you preached a quarter of a century ago; and as it would be an injustice to you, my lord, to believe that you had adopted it lightly, the world may, at least, in strict justice accuse you of not having had the courage to adhere to your opinion in the council of the Queen, whilst before God the heavy responsibility for the torrents of blood which will be shed in a few days must fall wholly on the heads of your colleagues, who have taken advantage of your weakness by doing violence to the convictions which sleep in the recesses of your conscience.

"Be so good, my lord, as to receive my letter with the sentiments which have dictated it, and of which I claim all the merit, not having had in my complete independence to ask counsel or advice from any one. Accept at the same time, my lord, the assurance of my highest consideration.

"COUNT SEEBACH.

"Château d'Unwürde, near Loeban, Saxony."

COUNT SEEBACH'S CHARGES AGAINST LORD BEACONSFIELD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,—An interesting letter addressed to Lord Beaconsfield from Comte Seebach, who was Saxon Minister at Paris during the Crimean War, appears in the *Nord* of June 23rd, from which I extract the following passages concerning Lord Beaconsfield, which conclusively show that his inner convictions on the Eastern Question are entirely at variance with his acts and language. Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, fully expecting the fall of the Government after the harrowing account of the dreadful sufferings of the English troops during the first winter of the Crimean War,

and that he would succeed to power, went to Paris to study the political situation, and put himself into communication with Comte Seebach, sitting at his feet as a disciple, "and placing our relations on the footing of intimacy by making me aware from the first of all the phases of the political life of the 'Nobody' of former times, as it pleased you to call yourself, and in acknowledging to me without concealment that, being on the point of reaching the summit of the social ladder, you had to ask me to render you a service which would aid you to surround your name with a new glory. . . Profoundly convinced that the coalition into which England had allowed itself to be inveigled reserved for it the part of a dupe, you promised yourself to dissolve it by concessions to the just requirements of the adversary (Russia), which would hasten, if necessary, in spite of France, the conclusion of peace. . . You did not doubt that you could establish an agreement (with Russia) by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston.

"According to you, the vital interests of the two Governments (England and Russia) demanded from them to remain closely united in Europe, as in Asia, to preserve to each the sphere of action agreed upon. . . .

"The programme which you had traced for yourself, determining distinctly its character and limits, knowing it to be identical with that which the Emperor Nicholas and Count Nesselrode in his long and brilliant career had used all their efforts to carry out, I was sure that the prospect of seeing it realised by your initiative would become at St. Petersburg an element of peace. I transmitted it then on your express demand to the Chancellor, with the request to bring it to the knowledge of his august master. Both welcomed it as the certain promise of an era of repose in Europe. As, since the time respecting which I have just spoken, all the events in the East have shown the truth of the fundamental principle of the policy which you advocated a quarter of a century ago, and as it would be an injustice to you, my lord, to think that you then adopted them inconsiderately, people may at least in fair justice accuse you of not having the courage of maintaining your opinion in the council of the Queen, whilst the responsibility before God for

the torrents of blood which will flow in a few days must fall wholly on your colleagues who have taken advantage of your weakness by violating the convictions which sleep in the recesses of your conscience."

It is clear from this important document that Lord Beaconsfield is, after all, only the tool of more designing colleagues, and that he is playing a part which is contrary to his convictions, and which he knows to be contrary to justice and to the interest of England. I may add that for the chief of the Opposition to send a message to the Czar intimating his entire disapproval of the policy then being pursued by his country, when we were at war with Russia, seems in the highest degree reprehensible and unpatriotic.

The Speaker has refused to allow me to put any question whatever on this subject to the Government in the House of Commons, but I sent the letter in the original French to Lord Beaconsfield, with a private letter from myself, and a copy of the question which I am not allowed to ask, because it relates to an event stated to have happened upwards of twenty years ago, when Lord Beaconsfield was not Minister!

Lord Beaconsfield, instead of committing himself by a written reply to my letter, has informed me, through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that he has no recollection of having made the statement attributed to him by Comte Seebach, but he does not positively deny their substantial or even their verbal accuracy, and no unprejudiced person can possibly believe that he can really have forgotten the substance of his communication through Comte Seebach to the Emperor of Russia. I have in my possession the original letter of Count Seebach to the editor of the *Nord*, written on paper bearing his monogram and coronet; also a letter from him to a Breslau paper, in which he pledges his word of honour that the letter to Lord Beaconsfield was not written at the instigation of Russia; and as I personally know the editor of the *Nord*, I am quite ready to assume the whole responsibility of guaranteeing the authenticity of this letter, and of stating my firm belief that every syllable which it contains is literally true.

Your obedient servant,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

LORD BEACONSFIELD AND COUNT SEEBACH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,—I observe in your columns to-day a letter from Sir Tollemache Sinclair, in which my name is mentioned, and which appears to require some explanation on my part.

Sir Tollemache Sinclair some days ago informed me that he was about to put a question to me on the subject of a letter which he said had been written by Count Seebach, but of which I had not previously heard. On my telling him that I knew nothing about it, he gave me a letter addressed to Lord Beaconsfield, which he had left unfastened in order that I might read it and give it to the Prime Minister, together with a notice that he was about to put a question to me on the subject.

I accordingly read the letter myself, and then sent it to Lord Beaconsfield. He wrote to me in reply a letter which I took down with me to the House of Commons, prepared to read it in answer to Sir Tollemache Sinclair's question, but I was informed by the Speaker that he had ruled that the question could not be put.

When I subsequently met Sir Tollemache in the lobby I had not the letter itself at hand, but I mentioned its general purport to him.

I much regret that Sir Tollemache did not express to me his wish to see the letter itself, as I should of course have shown it to him. There was no intentional want of courtesy towards him either on my own part or certainly on that of Lord Beaconsfield, who naturally regarded his letter to me as the answer to that which he had received at my hands, and to which he did not think that any other reply was expected.—I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

July 6. STAFFORD H. NORTHCOTE.

P.S.—I subjoin a copy of Lord Beaconsfield's letter.

"2, Whitehall-gardens, S.W., June 30, 1877.

"MY DEAR CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER,—I remember meeting Count Seebach, for the first time, at Paris after the Crimean War,

and when, by the by, there never was less prospect of a change in the Ministry of England. I was not aware until this moment of the important acquaintance I was making. I have not the slightest recollection of any observation I ever made to him; and I hope his Excellency will not be offended by my adding that I have not the slightest recollection of anything he ever said to me.

"I should think the Emperor of Russia and Prince Gortschakoff must have been a little surprised by being diplomatically informed of the casual remarks of a private member of Parliament.

"It proves, I think, that the duties of the Court of Saxony were not of an absorbing character.—Yours sincerely,

"(Signed) BEACONSFIELD."

To this I wrote the following rejoinder:—

COUNT SEEBACH AND LORD BEACONSFIELD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,—The Philo-Turkish portion of "society" seem to think that Lord Beaconsfield's short and evasive letter on the subject of Count Seebach's long and important communication, addressed to him in the *Nord* of the 24th of June, conclusively refutes it, because he states that he met him "for the first time at Paris after the Crimean War;" and if this statement were true Count Seebach would stand convicted before all Europe not only of a wilful and gratuitous falsehood, but of having accused the Prime Minister of England of conduct which falls but little short of treason, and it would have been quite unnecessary for him to have said anything more than the words I have just quoted, and the very fact that he makes several further remarks which, on his representation of the case, were superfluous, is in itself suspicious. It is, however, utterly absurd to suppose that even the most mendacious and unscrupulous individual in the whole world would commit such an obvious blunder as to say that he was intimately acquainted with Lord Beaconsfield during the Crimean War, and that he was requested by him to make a most important communication to the Emperor of Russia, when, in point of fact, he never

met him till after the Crimean War was over, when the message in question would have been wholly irrelevant and utterly useless; and this is the more incredible since Count Seebach is a veteran and skilful diplomatist, who had very great influence both with the Czar and the Emperor of the French, and is about the last individual who would have committed an easily detected fault, which, in the words of Talleyrand, would have been "worse than a crime." I have no doubt whatever that Count Seebach will immediately produce ample evidence, from the most unimpeachable sources, that he knew Lord Beaconsfield most intimately during the Crimean War, and when this is established every unprejudiced person will believe that everything which Count Seebach states in the letter of the 23rd of June is at least substantially correct. It will be observed that Count Seebach's letter is not only extremely courteous, but even flattering to Lord Beaconsfield, for, strangely enough, the Count does not appear to consider that the statements he makes involve very grave charges against him; but appears, on the contrary, to think they are very much to his credit, and it is therefore the more surprising that Lord Beaconsfield's reply is couched in the most offensive, disdainful, and depreciatory terms.

Lord Beaconsfield says, sarcastically, "I was not aware till this moment of the important acquaintance I was making;" but if so he was probably the only public man in Europe who professed the most superficial knowledge of foreign politics who was ignorant of Count Seebach's position and influence. He then proceeds to say, "I have not the slightest recollection of any observation I ever made to him . . . and I have not the slightest recollection of anything he ever said to me;" as much as to say that Count Seebach, who was a highly important personage in the opinion of the two Emperors, was such an insignificant individual in the judgment of that much greater man, Mr. Disraeli, that what the Count said to him went in at one ear and out at the other. Lord Beaconsfield concludes by saying, "I should think the Emperor of Russia and Prince Gortschakoff must have been a little surprised by being diplomatically informed of the casual remarks of a private member of Parliament. It proves, I think, that the duties of the Court of Saxony were not of an absorbing character."

Now, in the first place, Count Seebach expressly stated that it was to Count Nesselrode, then Chancellor of the Russian Empire, and not to Prince Gortschakoff, who did not fill that office, that Lord

Beaconsfield's message was sent; and I very much doubt if his lordship has even yet read the letter which I sent him in the original French, which he has undertaken to answer like Alexandre Dumas, who wrote an account of a tour which he never made at all.

Then, again, as Lord Beaconsfield had been in office in 1852, it is a prevarication to say that he was a private individual, and it is clear that a message sent by the leader of the Opposition to the Czar during the Crimean War, that he expected to be in power immediately, and that he "did not doubt that he would establish an agreement with Russia by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston, if necessary, in spite of France," cannot be fairly called "casual remarks of a private member of Parliament," and he would have scoffed at such a lame excuse if Count Seebach's letter had referred to Lord Hartington instead of to him. The Turcophiles, however, say that even if conclusive evidence can be produced to prove the substance of all Count Seebach has stated, it only amounts to a change of opinion as regards the proper policy of England towards Russia; but those who are careless or shallow enough to make such a remark fail to see the bearings of the case. It is obviously quite as allowable for Lord Beaconsfield to change his opinion in one direction as for Mr. Gladstone, who was in favour of the Crimean War, to alter his views in the opposite direction, and thus make that fair exchange of policies which is proverbially no robbery; but surely every one on reflection must see that, though Mr. Bright cordially disapproved of the Crimean War at the time, he would never have been guilty of so unpatriotic and unwise an act as to send a message to the Czar during the war, to say that if he became Minister of England he would reverse the policy of England, if necessary, in spite of France; whilst the boundless recklessness and egregious bungling of Lord Beaconsfield are conclusively established by the fact that he told the Turks before the Conference that England would not coerce them, and thus made the negotiations an inevitable failure, and the maintenance of peace absolutely impossible.

Suppose that before the battle of Inkerman was fought the Emperor of Russia contemplated making peace with us, it is obvious that if in the interval he received the message in question from the leader of the Opposition and expectant of power in England, he would undubitably determine to abandon the idea of agreeing to a peace on Lord Palmerston's hard terms when he was likely soon

to obtain much more advantageous conditions from the new Ministry, and thus the battle of Inkerman may have been fought, and the war prolonged, at an enormous cost of blood and treasure, in consequence of this mischievous and unjustifiable message. If it could be clearly proved that this supposed case actually occurred, there is hardly a man in England who would not hold that Lord Beaconsfield deserved at least perpetual ostracism from power; and if it did not take place, he is deserving of the severest censure for the results which might have ensued from his message.

The public will not fail to observe with astonishment that Lord Beaconsfield tardily treats this very grave charge affecting his personal honour and character, which is brought against him—not by an anonymous correspondent or an unknown or discredited individual, but by a distinguished foreign nobleman and diplomatist—with reckless and unbecoming levity, instead of promptly and categorically repelling such circumstantial, dishonouring, and compromising charges with indignation and scorn, and that he merely states that he does not recollect what he said to Count Seebach, which would not avail him in any court of law against the express, distinct, and positive assertions which the Count makes against him.

In conclusion, I wish to refer your readers to the very able and interesting article in the *World* on the subject, headed "A Lame Explanation."—Your obedient servant,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

TRANSLATION OF COUNT SEEBACH'S REJOINDER TO LORD BEACONSFIELD'S REPLY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE NORD."

SIR,—The contest in which Sir J. Tollemache Sinclair, member of the English Parliament, has engaged in the press with Lord Beaconsfield, obliges me to request you to publish the few lines by which, at the date of the 2nd inst., I authorised you to place at his disposal the original of the open letter, which I took the liberty of addressing to the noble lord and for which he asked you. Not having the honour of

personally knowing Sir T. Sinclair, I am so much the more deeply obliged for the sentiments which he has been so good as to testify towards me in his letter to the *Daily News*, republished by the *Nord* of the 9th inst., but my gratitude cannot go so far as to make me deviate from the line of conduct which I had marked out for myself after mature consideration. Neither to a greater or less extent will I take part in the suit for high treason which he has commenced against his adversary. Lord Beaconsfield is free to take refuge behind his feeble memory to confound it. His case fails; dates and men, all these little contrivances of which he has made use in the answer which he has deigned to make me through the medium of Sir Stafford Northcote and of Sir T. Sinclair, do not absolve him from the obligation to attempt a last effort in order to remember our conversations, if not as exactly as they live in my recollection and, perhaps, also *elsewhere*, but at least sufficiently to be able to lay his hand on his conscience to oppose to my clear and precise affirmations a denial quite as distinct and categorical. Even then, however, I would leave public opinion to speak, which will decide which of us two has had the less interest to falsify the truth. The incident in so far as it concerns me is then definitively terminated.

Accept, sir, the assurance of my distinguished consideration.

COUNT SEEBACH.

Château d'Unwürde, near Loeban, Saxony.
July 15, 1877.

A LAME EXPLANATION.

FROM THE "WORLD."

THE statements contained in the letter of Lord Beaconsfield, printed in the *Daily News* of Saturday last, in reply to Sir Tollemache Sinclair's quotations from the *Nord*, are of a truly surprising character. In the *Nord* of June 3rd there appeared a letter from Count Seebach, in which an account was given of a conversation held by him with Mr. Disraeli twenty years ago. According to this

narrative the then leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons drew up, for the benefit of the Saxon Minister in the French capital, the programme of an amicable concert to be established between England and Russia. This statement Lord Beaconsfield contradicts in a letter addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, saying, that while he recollects meeting Count Seebach in Paris he "was not aware of the important acquaintance he was making;" that "he has not the slighest recollection of any observation he ever made;" and that he thinks "the Emperor of Russia must have been a little surprised by being diplomatically informed of the casual remarks of a private Member of Parliament," uttered at a time "when there was no prospect of a change in the Ministry of England." Of course, in 1857, Mr. Disraeli was technically a private Member of Parliament, but he had been Chancellor of the Exchequer five years previously; he was the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, and his position was one of at least as great influence as Lord Hartington's now.

Secondly, it seems strange that Mr. Disraeli can have been ignorant of the "importance" of Count Seebach, who had married the daughter of Count Nesselrode, who was not merely well known in diplomatic circles, but who had been notoriously the representative of Russian interests during the Crimean War, and who was mainly instrumental in bringing about the preliminary negotiations for the Treaty of Paris.

Thirdly, as regards Lord Beaconsfield's remark on the apparent impossibility of the Conservatives coming into power in 1857, it is an impossibility which was certainly not recognized at the time. In that year Mr. Disraeli was engaged, and with a reasonable chance of success, in the attempt to form a Conservative coalition with the Peelites and the Liberal malcontents in opposition to Lord Palmerston, who had irritated and alienated the minds of many of his party by his supposed wish to prolong the war with Russia; and to such a coalition a speech made by Mr. Disraeli at the beginning of the Session of 1857 was manifestly intended to pave the way.

INTERVIEW OF AN ENGLISHMAN AND A TURKISH PASHA.

(From Kinglake's "Eöthen," now out of print.)

PASHA.—The Englishman is welcome; most blessed among hours is this the hour of his coming.

DRAGOMAN (*to the Traveller*).—The Pasha pays you his compliments.

TRAVELLER.—Give him my best compliments in return, and say I'm delighted to have the honour of seeing him.

DRAGOMAN (*to the Pasha*).—His Lordship, this Englishman, Lord of London, Scorner of Ireland, Suppressor of France, has quitted his government, and left his enemies to breathe for a moment, and has crossed the broad waters in strict disguise with a small, but eternally faithful retinue of followers, in order that he might look upon the bright countenance of the Pasha among Pashas—the Pasha of the everlasting Pashalik of Karagholookdoor.

TRAVELLER (*to the Dragoman*).—What on earth have you been saying *about London?* The Pasha will be taking me for a mere cockney. Have I not told you *always* to say that I am from a branch of the family of Mudcombe Park, and that I am to be a magistrate for the county of Bedfordshire, only I've not qualified; and that I should have been a deputy-lieutenant, if it had not been for the extraordinary conduct of Lord Mountpromise; and that I was a candidate for Goldborough at the last election, and that I should have won easy if my committee had not been

bought. I wish to heaven that, if you do say anything about me, you'd tell the simple truth.

DRAGOMAN is silent.

PASHA.—What says the friendly Lord of London? Is there aught that I can grant him within the Pashalik of Karagholookdoor.

DRAGOMAN (*growing sulky and literal*).—This friendly Englishman, this branch of Mudcombe, this head purveyor of Goldborough, this possible policeman of Bedfordshire, is recounting his achievements and the number of his titles.

PASHA.—The end of his honours is more distant than the ends of the earth, and the catalogue of his glorious deeds is brighter than the firmament of heaven!

DRAGOMAN (*to the Traveller*).—The Pasha congratulates your Excellency.

TRAVELLER.—About Goldborough? The deuce he does! but I want to get at his views in relation to the present state of the Ottoman Empire. Tell him the Houses of Parliament have met and that there has been a speech from the throne pledging England to preserve the integrity of the Sultan's dominions.

DRAGOMAN (*to the Pasha*).—This branch of Mudcombe, this possible policeman of Bedfordshire, informs your Highness that in England the talking houses have met, and that the integrity of the Sultan's dominions has been assured for ever and ever by a speech from the velvet chair.

PASHA.—Wonderful chair! wonderful houses! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels! Whiz, whiz! all by steam! Wonderful chair, wonderful houses, wonderful people! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels! Whiz, whiz! all by steam!

TRAVELLER (*to the Dragoman*).—What does the Pasha mean by that whizzing? He does not mean to say, does he, that our Government will ever abandon their pledges to the Sultan?

DRAGOMAN.—No, your Excellency, but he says the English talk by wheels and by steam.

TRAVELLER.—That's an exaggeration; but say that the English really have carried machinery to great perfection. Tell the Pasha

(he'll be struck with that) that, whenever we have any disturbances to put down, even at two or three hundred miles from London, we can send troops by the thousand to the scene of action in a few hours.

DRAGOMAN (*recovering his temper and freedom of speech*).—His Excellency, this Lord of Mudcombe, observes to your Highness that whenever the Irish or the French or the Indians rebel against the English, whole armies of soldiers and brigades of artillery are dropped into a mighty chasm, called Euston Square, and in the biting of a cartridge they arise up again in Manchester, or Dublin, or Paris, or Delhi, and utterly exterminate the enemies of England from the face of the earth.

PASHA.—I know it—I know all. The particulars have been faithfully related to me, and my mind comprehends locomotives. The armies of the English ride upon the vapours of boiling cauldrons, and their horses are flaming coals! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels. Whiz, whiz! all by steam!

TRAVELLER (*to his Dragoman*).—I wish to have the opinion of an unprejudiced Ottoman gentleman as to the prospects of our English commerce and manufactures; just ask the Pasha to give me his views on the subject.

PASHA (*after having received the communication from the Dragoman*).—The ships of the English swarm like flies; their printed calicoes cover the whole earth, and by the side of their swords the blades of Damascus are blades of grass. All India is but an item in the ledger books of the merchants, whose lumber rooms are filled with ancient thrones! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels; Whiz, whiz! all by steam!

DRAGOMAN.—The Pasha compliments the cutlery of England, and also the East India Company.

TRAVELLER.—The Pasha's right about the cutlery (I tried my scimitar with the common officers' swords (Wilkinson's?) belonging to our fellows at Malta, and they cut it like the leaf of a novel). Well (*to the Dragoman*), tell the Pasha I am exceedingly gratified to find that he entertains such a high opinion of our manufacturing energy, but I should like him to know, though

that we have got something in England besides that. These foreigners are always imagining that we have nothing but ships and railways and East India Companies. Do just tell the Pasha that our rural districts deserve his attention, and that even within the last two hundred years there has been an evident improvement in the culture of the turnip; and if he does not take any interest about that, at all events, you can explain that we have our virtues in the country, that we are a truth-telling people, and like the Osmanlees, are faithful in the performance of our promises. Oh, by the by, whilst you are about it, you may as well just say at the end, that the British yeoman is still, thank God! the British yeoman.

PASHA (*after hearing the Dragoman*).—It is true! it is true! Through all Feringhistan the English are foremost and best; for the Russians are drilled swine, and the Germans are sleeping babes, and the Italians are the servants of songs, and the French are the sons of newspapers, and the Greeks they are weavers of lies, but the English and the Osmanlees are brothers together in righteousness; for the Osmanlees believe in one only God, and cleave to the Koran and destroy idols, so do the English worship one God and abominate graven images, and tell the truth, and believe in a book; and though they drink the juice of the grape, yet to say that they worship their prophet as God, or to say that they are eaters of pork, these are lies—lies born of Greeks and nursed by Jews.

DRAGOMAN.—The Pasha compliments the English.

TRAVELLER (*rising*).—Well, I've had enough of this. Tell the Pasha I am greatly obliged to him for his hospitality, and still more for his kindness in furnishing me with horses and say that I must now be off.

PASHA (*after hearing the Dragoman, and standing up on his divan*).—Proud are the sires, and blessed are the dams of the horses that shall carry his Excellency to the end of his prosperous journey. May the saddle beneath him glide down to the gates of the happy city like a boat swimming in the third river of Paradise. May he sleep the sleep of a child when his friends are around him,

and while that his enemies are abroad, may his eyes flame red through the darkness more red than the eyes of ten tigers! Farewell.

DRAGOMAN.—The Pasha wishes your Excellency a pleasant journey.

So ends the visit.

SKETCH OF MANNERS IN THE EAST, BY THACKERAY.

ALL their humour, my dragoman tells me, is of this questionable sort; and a young Egyptian gentleman, son of a Pasha, whom I subsequently met at Malta, confirmed the statement, and gave a detail of the practices of private life which was anything but edifying. The great aim of woman, he said, in the much-maligned Orient, is to administer to the brutality of her lord; her merit is in knowing how to vary the beast's pleasures. He could give us no idea, he said, of the *wit* of the Egyptian women, and their skill in *double entendre;* nor, I presume, did we lose much by our ignorance. What I would urge, humbly, however, is this: Do not let us be led away by German writers and æsthetics, Semilassoisms, Hahnhahnisms, and the like. The life of the East is a life of brutes. The much maligned Orient, I am confident, has not been maligned near enough; for the good reason that none of us can tell the amount of horrible sensuality practised there.

Beyond the jack-pudding rascal and his audience, there was on the green a spot, on which was pointed out to me a mark, as of blood. That morning the blood had spouted from the neck of an Arnaoot soldier, who had been executed for murder. These Arnaoots are the curse and terror of the citizens. Their camps are without the city; but they are always brawling, or drunken, or murdering within, in spite of the rigid law which is applied to them, and which brings one or more of the scoundrels to death almost every week.

Some of our party had seen this fellow borne by the hotel the day before, in the midst of a crowd of soldiers who had apprehended him. The man was still formidable to his score of captors. His clothes had been torn off; his limbs were bound with cords; but he was struggling frantically to get free; and my informant described the figure and appearance of the naked, bound, writhing savage, as quite a model of beauty.

Walking in the street, this fellow had just before been struck by the looks of a woman who was passing, and laid hands on her. She ran away, and he pursued her. She ran into the police-barrack, which was luckily hard by; but the Arnaoot was nothing daunted, and followed into the midst of the police. One of them tried to stop him. The Arnaoot pulled out a pistol, and shot the policeman dead. He cut down three or four more before he was secured. He knew his inevitable end must be death: that he could not seize upon the woman: that he could not hope to resist half a regiment of armed soldiers: yet his instinct of lust and murder was too strong; and so he had his head taken off quite calmly this morning, many of his comrades attending their brother's last moments. He cared not the least about dying; and knelt down and had his head off as coolly as if he were looking on at the same ceremony performed on another.

When the head was off, and the blood was spouting on the ground, a married woman, who had no children, came forward very eagerly out of the crowd to smear herself with it—the application of criminals' blood being considered a very favourable medicine for women afflicted with barrenness, so she indulged in this remedy.

But one of the Arnaoots standing near said, "What! you likes blood, do you?" (or words to that effect.) "Let's see how your's mixes with my comrade's." And thereupon, taking out a pistol, he shot the woman in the midst of the crowd and the guards who were attending the execution; was seized of course by the latter; and no doubt to-morrow morning will have *his* head off too. It would be a good chapter to write—the Death of the Arnaoot—but I shan't go. Seeing one man hanged is quite enough in the course of a life. *J'y ai été*, as the Frenchman said of hunting.

These Arnaoots are the terror of the town. They seized hold of an Englishman the other day, and were very near pistolling him. Last week one of them murdered a shopkeeper at Boulak, who refused to sell him a water-melon at a price which he, the soldier, fixed upon it. So, for the matter of three-halfpence, he killed the shopkeeper; and had his own rascally head chopped off, universally regretted by his friends. Why, I wonder, does not his Highness the Pasha invite the Arnaoots to a *déjeûner* at the Citadel, as he did the Mamelukes, and serve them up the same sort of breakfast? The walls are considerably heightened since Emin Bey and his horse leapt them, and it is probable that not one of them would escape.

This sort of pistol practice is common enough here, it would appear; and not among the Arnaoots merely, but the higher orders. Thus, a short time since, one of his Highness's grandsons, whom I shall call Bluebeard Pasha (lest a revelation of the name of the said Pasha might interrupt our good relations with his country)—one of the young Pashas being backward rather in his education, and anxious to learn mathematics, and the elegant deportment of civilized life, sent to England for a tutor. I have heard he was a Cambridge man, and had learned both algebra and politeness under the Reverend Doctor Whizzle, of ——— College.

One day, when Mr. MacWhirter, B.A., was walking in Shoubra gardens, with his Highness the young Bluebeard Pasha, inducting him into the usages of polished society, and favouring him with reminiscences of Trumpington, there came up a poor fellah, who flung himself at the feet of young Bluebeard, and calling for justice in a loud and pathetic voice, and holding out a petition, besought his Highness to cast a gracious eye upon the same, and see that his slave had justice done him.

Bluebeard Pasha was so deeply engaged and interested by his respected tutor's conversation, that he told the poor fellah to go to the deuce, and resumed the discourse which his ill-timed outcry for justice had interrupted. But the unlucky wight of a fellah was pushed by his evil destiny, and thought he would make yet another application. So he took a short cut down one of the garden lanes,

and as the Prince and the Reverend Mr. MacWhirter, his tutor, came along, once more engaged in pleasant disquisition, behold the fellah was once more in their way, kneeling at the august Bluebeard's feet, yelling out for justice as before, and thrusting his petition into the royal face.

When the Prince's conversation was thus interrupted a second time, his royal patience and clemency were at an end. "Man," said he, "once before I bade thee not to pester me with thy clamour, and lo! you have disobeyed me—take the consequences of disobedience to a Prince, and thy blood be upon thine own head." So saying, he drew out a pistol, and blew out the brains of that fellah, so that he never bawled out for justice any more.

The Reverend Mr. MacWhirter was astonished at this mode of proceeding: "Gracious Prince," said he, "we do not shoot an Undergraduate at Cambridge even for walking over a college grassplot. Let me suggest to your Royal Highness that this method of ridding yourself of a poor devil's importunities is such as we should consider abrupt and almost cruel in Europe. Let me beg you to moderate your royal impetuosity for the future; and, as your Highness's tutor, entreat you to be a little less prodigal of your powder and shot."

"O Mollah!" said his Highness, here interrupting his governor's affectionate appeal, "you are good to talk about Trumpington and the Pons Asinorum, but if you interfere with the course of justice in any way, or prevent me from shooting any dog of an Arab who snarls at my heels, I have another pistol; and, by the beard of the prophet, a bullet for you too!" So saying, he pulled out the weapon, with such a terrific and significant glance at the Reverend Mr. MacWhirter, that that gentleman wished himself back in his Combination Room again; and is by this time, let us hope, safely housed there.

EXTRACT FROM "RIDE TO KHIVA."

(*From Punch.*)

INSTEAD of replying to so harmless a book as Captain Burnaby's, I subjoin extracts from the "Diary of my Ride to Khiva," from Mr. Burnand's clever *Punch* papers :—

"He thought he had better retain the horse with thankshi (*i.e.*, Tartar expression of gratitude). The horse will be of the greatest use to me. Note, crossed another river, or the same, the Oxus, I fancy.

"Met a Kirghiz man—a Kirghiz man is a sort of travelling butcher, who sells Kirghizzes (*i.e.*, Tartaric for carcasses)—the day after the one last mentioned.

"Met sixteen wolves to-day, all wrapped up in sheep's clothing to keep themselves warm. Tried Mr. Gladstone's name on them with excellent effect; have not seen them again.

"Wednesday.—Came up to fort number one. Found General Kauffman here taking care of number one. Gave Kauffman some lozenges for his voice. 'Kauff, man, no more,' said I, pleasantly, and he went into fits. I asked him if we should be stopped before we got to Khiva. He answered with considerable caution, and put his finger to his nose. The last thing I saw of the old General was his left eye, as he winked at us through a loop-hole in fort number one. Thermometer going down to twenty degrees below nothing.

"I was belated for one night and ran short of provisions, but—you know what a good legerdemainist I am—well, I made an omelette in my hat, drank a glass of Pommard (this sounds like something for the hair, but it isn't when properly pronounced) from the inexhaustible bottle, made an orange tree grow, took an orange for dessert, and went to sleep.

"12 mid-day:—Stopped to lunchski, as we call it in this country. The driver eats tallow candles and drinks wickski, a Russian spirit distilled from candle ends. A Russian never takes a bath, he always goes in for a dip. Came to a sign-post; examined it; found I had been for two days riding towards Persia. . . Met a Tartar gentleman on the road. He asked us to share his dinner with him, potski luckski, as they call it here. I hope to be dressed in kremlin, a peculiar sort of warm waterproof coat, and kopeck, a head-dress worn at night, when travelling through the snow and tied under the chin with a small moujik, a kind of leather thong with a silver clasp.

"Russian is spoken as read backwards, and takes some time to master.

"5.30. A.M.—Sleigh driver wrapped up in thick capes, five in number. Sleigh driver's boy up behind with buns to feed the wolves. This was a happy idea of mine, based upon early recollections of the Zoological Gardens. I never yet knew a wolf or a bear refuse a bun.

"One o'clock.—Time for lunchski preparations. Suddenly wolves appear within a mile of us. No lunchski—horrid thought! One o'clock must be the hour of the wolves' lunchski. Can the horse do it? The wolves! the wolves! Send cheque at once. This is my last appeal; forward it by my friend. If we can only give wolves a check.

10, night.—The Towers of Gladitzova in sight. Horse dropping! Children must be thrown over! Begun with sleigh-driver's boy. Sleigh-driver's boy suggests beginning with sleigh-driver. The wolves are within two hundred yards of us. It must be done! The sleigh-driver has five capes, a thick fur coat, and a whip. With the whip he can defend himself, and the wolves will be a long time before they can get through his capes, his boots, and at him. Wolves within one hundred yards. One wild cry—a struggle—it is done.

"3.30 P.M.—Distant mountains melted. First view of Khiva. See distinctly the name over the gate."

"PUNCH" ON ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES.

Philo-Turk (*triumphantly*). — Aha! judicious and judicial *Mr. Punch*, what do you *now* think of the great atrocity question? Time for the St. James's Hall sentimentalists to shut up shop, eh?

Mr. Punch.—And why, my jubilant friend?

Philo-Turk.—Why? Hasn't Cossack cruelty quite put Bashi-Bazouk barbarity into the shade? Hasn't the Muscovite lamb proved himself a more sanguinary butcher than the Ottoman wolf? But, of course, *you* won't admit it. Party philanthropy is conveniently blind of one eye.

Mr. Punch (*calmly*).—As was shown when the accounts of the Bulgarian horrors were pooh-poohed as "coffee-house babble"——

Philo-Turk (*eagerly*).—Oh, that was before they were proved to be well-founded.

Mr. Punch.—Is the same desire to wait for proof shown in the same quarters now? Party spirit is always one-eyed, but it is the special business of *Mr. Punch* to keep both his eyes open.

Philo-Turk.—Then be so good as to cast them over these recent accounts of Russian atrocities, and tell me what you think of them.

Mr. Punch.—I have already done so. At the risk of raising your wrath, I must sum up my judgment, for the present, thus:—"Cases not parallel, and facts not proven." Nay, do not explode, and do not misunderstand me. If the Russians *have* rivalled the Turks in ruffianism, *Mr. Punch* will be the last to palliate or condone their unpardonable offence against humanity, honesty, and —policy.

My bâton falls with equal thwacks,
Whate'er their robes, on rascals' backs.

It has had occasion to fall heavily on Muscovite shoulders before now, and may again. But discrimination is not partiality. The incidental and unpremeditated horrors of a furious war do *not* afford a parallel to the deliberate brutalities of an inhuman rule. When it is shown that the Russian "atrocities" *are* parallel to the horrors of Bulgaria, not only in being bloody and bestial, but in being deliberate and unpunished—nay, *rewarded*—then *Mr. Punch* will have a word to say on the subject which even PHILO-TURK will not find feeble or apologetic. But until that is made clear to a candid judgment, *Mr. Punch* declines to greet every big-capitalled account of "Russian Atrocities" with a howl which smacks more of partisan triumph than humane horror.

Philo-Turk.—Pot and kettle, *Mr. Punch*—pot and kettle!

Mr. Punch.—Well, at any rate, "it was kettle began it;" and the Turkish kettle's denunciation of the Russian pot might come with better grace had it been preceded by recognition of his own yet deeper blackness.

Philo-Turk.—But at least you'll own the Russian has not a very clean record?

Mr. Punch.—He has not; and he is now suffering in public judgment for the blots on the pages of his past. It is the less necessary to make a case against him, as some seem so anxious to do. For that, plenty of materials are sure to be forthcoming when a semi-civilized power meets its hereditary enemy face to face, in defence, whether disinterestedly or not, of a subject race embittered and brutalized by centuries of oppression and outrage.

Philo-Turk.—But would the Russian make a better master of the Bulgarian than the Turk has made?

Mr. Punch.—In the long run probably he would—though, remembering Poland, and regarding popular opinion, it requires the courage of *Mr. Punch* to say so. The Russians are a growing and an improving people, sympathetic in race and religion with those they are fighting for. The Turk is effete, unimprovable, and an alien in religion and in race. But it is not a question of change of masters. It is because the action of Russia opens up to far-seeing men a prospect of emancipation beyond her own

purposes or desires, that lovers of freedom lean to her side in this particular issue. But if the self-appointed champion turn tyrant and butcher, be sure the butcher shall be denounced and the tyrant withstood.

Philo-Turk.—Ah, yes—when it is too late!

Mr. Punch.—The plausible reproach that raw haste is always hurling at the deliberation it mistakes for delay. To move in wild fear of danger before the summons of duty sounds is as unmanly, and may be as disastrous, as to lag when it sounds indeed.

Philo-Turk.—You think, then, it has not sounded yet?

Mr. Punch.—It sounded one charge some time since; but at the desire of those who are now so clamorous, was unhappily disregarded. At present it is silent. Trust *Mr. Punch* to catch the first notes of the alarum, and to echo it with all his vigour of lung and trumpet.

A FEW REMARKS ON THE ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES.

WITH reference to the Polish atrocities, I have discussed the subject with sufficient fulness in the chapter headed "Poland from a Common Sense Point of View," and I have quoted the whole of what Mr. Gladstone has stated with reference to those with which Russia has been charged in Turkistan, and I need not, therefore, touch upon them here.

With regard to the alleged Russian atrocities during the present war, I have to remark that if one was not already accustomed to Turkish mendacity and recklessness, one would be startled by the audacity with which Aarifi Pasha pretends to have ascertained the exact number of Turks massacred by the Russians, for, whilst Mr. Baring could only estimate in thousands, the Pasha not only descends to hundreds or even tens, but even to one man, his figures being 4,763, to say nothing of those burnt in the mosque; but the *Daily Telegraph* of July 25th trumps even Aarifi Pasha, for it states "*the Bulgarian atrocities are as nothing compared with the desolation the Russians are causing* wherever they make their appearance, or with the murderous slaughters of the old, young, and weak that follow in their footsteps."

The *Daily Telegraph*, which is well known as a sensational journal in the American style, conducted by Jewish proprietors, seems to think there is no bounds to the credulity of the public, and I would venture to suggest that even its imaginative powers are far exceeded by those of Dr. Kenealy, whose services would

be invaluable as an editor or correspondent with a fancy which can hardly be surpassed, since, while the *Daily Telegraph* only magnifies Aarifi Pasha's figures from 4,763 to the 20,000, which is the least number which can be deduced from Mr. Schuyler's report, the Doctor, as I have already stated, said that the English had massacred 4,000,000,000 of people, a number which would suffice to girdle the globe with about 180 parallel rows of human bodies, each touching the other, or a pillar 4,000 miles high, or 1,300 Mont Blancs piled on the top of each other; whilst, if the skulls were as thick and the hearts as hard as those of many of the Turcophiles, they would make the strongest road in the world, fit for the passage of the heaviest artillery.

Mr. Goschen said at Fishmongers' Hall, "Still less would he make a speech of blood and thunder (he might have added, 'of greased lightning'), because he was not a contributor to the *Daily Telegraph*" (so that whatever Egypt may be, Turkey is not a land of *Goschen*), and that newspaper, whose war correspondent probably well knew the meaning of Turkish backsheesh, should now assume the title of the "Munchausen Gazette," the "Derby Dilly Trumpeter," the "Anti-Gladstonian," or the "Blood and Thunder News."

If the Russian soldiery are so ferocious, it is very singular that the French never complained of Russian atrocities so far back as the French retreat from Moscow, and surely they have improved in humanity instead of degenerating since that time; on the other hand, the abominable and bestial cruelties of the Turcos in the Franco-German war are notorious, and it is probably on account of their unrivalled inhumanity that in the English Prayer-book we pray especially for Jews and Turks and name no other races. On the other hand, the Russophobes and Turcomaniacs in England apparently exclaim with Tom Hood's needlewoman in the "Song of a Shirt"—

> "'Tis oh, to *have* a slave
> *As well as* the barbarous Turk,
> Where woman has never a soul to save,
> *And tortured* Christians work."

The first point which it is necessary for the Philo-Turks to establish is, that any atrocities were ever committed; secondly, the extent and nature of these atrocities; and lastly, that they were committed by the Russians and not by the Bulgarians; for surely atrocities committed in revenge for previous massacres by the Bulgarians are less culpable than similar acts committed by the Russian soldiers, whose hearths and homes have not been destroyed by the Turks; and the Russians cannot fairly have Bulgarian atrocities fathered upon them, any more than we should have been accountable during the Crimean War for any cruel acts performed by our French, Italian, or Turkish allies; or than the French soldiers were held accountable for the horrible cruelties perpetrated by the Turcos on the German wounded in the Franco-German war.

The only accusation deserving of full credit is that contained in the telegram from the twenty representatives of the Press, dated Shumla, July 10th, 1877, in which "they declare they have seen with their own eyes, and questioned, at Rasgrad and at Shumla, children, women, and old men suffering from lance and sabre wounds, not to mention the shot wounds which might be attributed to the chances of legitimate conflict. These victims give horrible accounts of the treatment of fugitive Mussulmans by the Russian troops, and sometimes also by the Bulgarians. *According to their statements* the entire population of several villages have been massacred either on the roads or in the villages which were being pillaged. Every day more wounded people arrive. The undersigned declare that the women and children are most numerous among the victims, and that the wounds are lance wounds."

Now, the first reflection which occurs to one's mind is, that the Turks must be an arrant set of fools and cowards to have left their women and children in the lurch, instead of carrying them off, or, if that was impossible, remaining to protect them and share their fate, but this is only what one might expect from them, since the *Times* correspondent says, "After the battle in the Shipka Pass, the prisoners stated that the Pasha went away first,

and was soon followed by 10,000 men, all regulars; and that these positions, abandoned by the Turks, were so well fortified that the Russians could not help admiring their construction," so that a handful of really brave men might have held them against a much greater force than that of the Russians.

The newspaper correspondents in the first portion of their telegram say that the wounds were lance and *sabre* wounds, whilst at the close they say they are lance wounds, and this shows that they are not quite certain of their facts. One wonders also that they did not count, or at least approximately estimate, the victims; no one can form any idea whether only two men, two women, and two children were wounded, or whether there were tens, hundreds, thousands, or Dr. Kenealy would perhaps estimate them at millions, of victims.

The correspondents do not say whether the children were helpless babies, such as those the Turks toss on bayonets or rip out of their mothers' wombs, or were strong boys, such as those who may be observed in a woodcut of the *Illustrated London News* (of July 28) dragging up a Krupp gun to be used against the Russians; and of course it would be an atrocity if the Russian cavalry, by using the lance, compelled them to desist.

Referring to the Parliamentary Paper now before me, I find that Mr. Layard, our ambassador, the well-known thick and thin supporter of Turkey, whose appointment was characterised by the Turks as "a delicate attention," says that "the Porte states that above 1,000 Circassians were put to death, no quarter having been given to a force of Circassian cavalry that had been surprised during the night." I suppose, therefore, that Mr. Layard considers that the Turks have the sole right of killing their enemies in fair battle, whilst the Russians have the privilege of being killed. We then have the cloven foot of the "Daily Bellowgraph," confirming a report that from 1,000 to 1,500 of the inhabitants of Ardahan were massacred by the Russians, but Lord Derby says in his despatch, dated July 17, 1877, that the number killed was 800, and that they were killed, not by the Russians, but by the Lesghian troops in the Russian service.

The *Daily News* says: "It is not difficult to understand what are termed by the *Daily Telegraph* 'Russian atrocities.' The Turkish inhabitants of Bulgaria fall back on the advance of the Russians, carrying off, in a long train, not only their own flocks and herds, but the flocks and herds of their Bulgarian neighbours. Their retreating trains are surrounded by armed men to defend them. The Cossack cavalry, who scour the country, when they come up with these trains, call upon them to surrender their *impedimenta*. The armed Turks refuse, and then shots are exchanged, and a scrimmage ensues. Naturally, some of the women and children, who are in the waggons in the midst of the train, get hit; but—and I speak entirely without prejudice, and merely as an impartial looker-on—this seems to me to be the fault of the Turks, who, instead of surrendering their flocks and herds, and those of their neighbours that they have laid hands on, prefer to risk, not only their own lives, but those of their wives and children. If there is one rule of war more clearly established than another, it is, that the peaceful inhabitants of an invaded country must submit to the orders of the invaders, and that they must either refrain from hostile acts, or take the consequences of not refraining from them. This, the Germans, during the Franco-German war, had some difficulty in impressing upon the French peasantry. But, as the peasantry were intelligent enough to perceive the necessity of the distinction, they very soon honestly accepted it, and acted on it."

To show how the Turks deal with murderers, even when convicted and sentenced, I quote from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February 1, 1877:—"A French Consul having been assassinated by a subject of Abdul Medjid, the French embassy exacted the rigorous punishment of the culprit, who was apprehended and tried. The murderer was unanimously condemned to hard labour in perpetuity. Some days after, the secretary of the embassy, who had been assessor at the trial, making an excursion to Broussa, had the unexpected pleasure of meeting at the corner of the street a face which he recognised. It was that of the murderer, of whom the

penalty had been commuted, and whose hard labour consisted in going about freely wherever he chose. He had only killed a Ghiaour."

The *Times* states:—"Sir Arnold Kemball has telegraphed, 'Atrocities by Russians at Ardahan quite untrue,' and that part of the Russian forces at Bayazid were massacred after they had surrendered." Another *Times* correspondent says, "Here in a barn, covered with a little straw, we found the bodies of three people (Bulgarians)—a young fair-haired woman of about twenty to twenty-two, with a full round form and light golden hair in great masses all about her face and shoulders lying across the bodies of apparently two men, though it is possible there may have been more. It was an awful sight, and the story seemed self-evident. The men had been murdered first, and the woman, having first been ravished, had been thrown across their bodies. . . . The evidence convinced me that this massacre had been a cold-blooded, undeserved attack by the Bashi-Bazouks on the defenceless Bulgarians. To begin with, not one single Turkish corpse has been or apparently can be produced. . . . The General Selim Pasha said to the station-master, 'For God's sake, get those people away, for I cannot answer for my troops.' . . . It is painful to see the magnificent crops all ready for carting, left rotting in the fields for hundreds of miles. The terror is so great that they have not the heart to gather them in, besides which, every cart or waggon is away with fugitives."

It therefore appears that the Turcomaniacs in England have a far better opinion of the Turkish troops than that which is held by even the Turkish generals.

The Russian Ambassador writes to the *Times* to say that in the Schipka Pass the Turks, not being able to defend a position, hoisted the white flag. The Russians ceased firing and advanced, when they were received with a frightful and treacherous discharge of grape shot and musketry. The Turks then fled, and the Russians found a large heap of heads of their soldiers, who had been wounded, made prisoners, and then massacred and decapitated.

The correspondent of the *Times* with the Turkish army in Armenia writes :—" Of course, Turkish official accounts tell of the atrocities committed by the Russians, pillaging of villages, outrages on women, and slaying of children being freely attributed to the foe. I believe none of these things. I have now for the last week been following in the wake of the retiring Russian army, and can see no traces nor hear any reports of any such misdeeds. On the contrary, they appeared to have behaved with the greatest moderation and paid for everything they consumed. . . . I regret that now I have to place on record an act which reflects the greatest discredit on the Turkish commander. On the 3rd inst., two Karakapaks were seized by a Circassian patrol, they were taken up before the Muchir, quietly led to a secluded spot, and there by his orders shot and left to lie unburied on the bare hillside. . . . I trust that all who did see the ghastly sight will place on record their detestation of the cowardly deed, so utterly opposed to all sense of justice, and so opposed to all military law. General Loris Melikoff said to me, 'Had we been at war with a civilized people, I would have written a letter to inform the authorities that I had left so many hundred wounded in such and such a village, and requested that their persons should be respected. But here it would be madness to trust them, and so I was obliged to retreat; otherwise, I assure you, I should have advanced, and by this time would have been before Erzeroum. In this way the Turks have a great advantage over us, which is totally one sided, for we, on the contrary, take as great care of Turkish wounded prisoners as of our own. For example, *at Ardahan we found an hospital with* 800 *Turks. They were totally destitute of medical appliances,* and, although my stores of bandages and medicines were insufficient for my own uses, I gave orders that everything should be divided impartially between the two nationalities.' "

The heroism of the Russian marine appears from the following circumstance, which also shows the utter worthlessness of the Turkish navy. The "Vesta," an ordinary trading steamer, with some mortars under the Russian Captain Basanoff, fought for five hours with a large Turkish ironclad with a twelve-inch cuirass, and

would probably have captured her if two other Turkish men-of-war had not come to the ironclad's assistance, when the "Vesta" escaped.

The *Stamboul*, Constantinople newspaper, of July 19th, calls attention to one flagrant case of fabrication (of Russian and Christian cruelties) which had appeared in the semi-official *Turquie* of the preceding day, and which was so badly put together as to bear internal evidence of falsehood; and these papers, for daring to deviate into truth, were soon after suspended by the Porte.

The *Times* correspondent at Constantinople writes:—"Atrocity-mongering goes on amongst otherwise perfectly honest men. They turn bewildered and disgusted from the mass of contradictory evidence presented to them, and, in despair, end in believing what naturally they are predisposed to believe, namely, pretty nearly everything that tells for their own party, and little or nothing that tells against it. Even official reports, written with the fullest sense of responsibility present or future, cannot always be trusted: Not that the writers, usually gentlemen, with a character and position at stake, have the deliberate intention to deceive, but either they approach the enquiry with a *parti pris*, or they have the sole or easiest access to sources of information from which they see only one side. Your readers will kindly remember that any Turkish atrocities must always arrive a week or so later than any Russian crimes, but in the provinces, where the officials control not merely telegrams but even letters of correspondents, none but Russian atrocities can be sent in any way, and the more of these the correspondent sends the higher the favour he enjoys, and the greater the facilities given him for moving from place to place and transmitting news. This had led in some instances to very ignoble bidding for official patronage and protection. I am told on perfectly trustworthy testimony of one correspondent (query, was this the correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph?*) who offered to send whatever the authorities liked. They might, if they so pleased, dictate his letters, if in return they would give him advantages not conceded to the rest of his professional brethren. Another correspondent stooped to the trick of altering a letter in-

tended for a London newspaper without the writer's knowledge, though of course with the connivance of the Turkish authorities, and presumably to curry favour with them. In this particular instance, the trick was detected through the mistake of taking into his confidence *a correspondent who happened to be a gentleman;* but how often it has been tried and succeeded in other instances there is no means of ascertaining."

The Karakapaks, who have committed some depredations in Armenia, are Mussulman bands living on Turkish territory, and for whose services the Russians pay only because they would fight against them. The Constantinople correspondent of the *Standard* attributes the alleged acts of cruelty and pillage to the Bulgarians and not to the Russians, whilst the correspondent of the *Cologne Gazette*, though that paper is ardently Turkophile, says, "The Russian soldier, in fact, is of a kindly disposition. He is under a discipline which of itself would restrain him from certain excesses. I have nowhere seen that Russian soldiers have given way to blamable excesses. As soon as the Russians enter into districts they establish order everywhere, and take the mosques under their special protection."

The *Times* correspondent with the Turkish army in Asia writes: "I do not know why some of the money collected in England for the relief of Turkish soldiers has not been diverted from the capacious maw of the European Turkish army to the far worse equipped 4th Army Corps (in Asia). Here the men have received no pay for two years, their rations are distributed with gross irregularity, and it is a very rare occurrence for the men ever to see meat. Thus on short commons, unable to purchase even the commonest necessaries of life, it is not to be wondered at that the unfortunate soldiers suffer terribly from sickness, and when once struck down, it is still less surprising that the death-rate is so high. I can only trust that, should the good people of England forward any sums of money to Erzeroum to be expended on behalf of the Turkish soldiers, they will annex as a condition *that it is on no account to pass through Turkish hands.*

"Last night a party of Circassians captured a Russian post bag,

containing some eighty private letters from officers present at the battle of Lewin. There is a great difference between the 5,000 killed and wounded of the Turkish dispatch, and the 790 of the Russian officers' letters. . . . Mr. Williams, who accompanied the staff of Reiss Ahmed Pasha, saw the Kurds busy opening the graves and despoiling the corpses of their clothes. A grave containing some Turkish bodies had been opened and the bodies disinterred. These were all clothed in uniform, showing that the Russians respect the bodies of their slain, and bury them with decency. On our (the Turkish) side, however, I regret to say that *both officers and men roam over the field*, stripping all the corpses, which are invariably buried naked. . . . The custom of despoiling the slain is openly sanctioned by authority."

A naval correspondent of the *Times* writes from Therapia: "I wish it to be understood that myself and two Europeans by whom I was accompanied failed to find the slightest trace of a massacre, either in our quarter or the other; nor could the large bribe of a napoleon for any single corpse I could be shown purchase anybody who could earn it. I also went to the trouble with my interpreter of looking into every single waggon that was loading with refugees, and I spent nearly an hour with him cross-questioning them about it. Not a single man, woman, or child had a scratch to show, though naturally only too eager to do so."

Le Temps says: "The dead and wounded Russians who had fallen into their hands had been decapitated and mutilated. I saw yesterday the field of battle and the mutilated corpses. In spite of the general indignation, care is given to the Turkish wounded, and the Turkish ambulance of Kazanlyk has been scrupulously respected."

The *Times* says: "The Catholic Priests excite hatred (in Bosnia) against the members of the Orthodox Greek Church, and declare that the Mahometans are much nearer to them than the schismatical Slavs. They have succeeded, with the consent of the Turkish authorities, in organising a (Roman) Catholic legion, which has been provided with the uniform of the Nizam, and this evening this new levy has marched against the insurgents."

Mr. Layard is compelled to admit that "the captain of

H.M.S. 'Rapid' informs me that the Turks are withdrawing from the Dobrudscha. *Everything has been destroyed*, and the Christians are exposed to great outrages from Circassians and Tartars, *many* being killed." Though *everything was wantonly destroyed, even their own property, by the Turks*, the Russians are subsequently accused of destroying what consequently did not exist. We have afterwards a telegram from Safvet Pasha (whose mendacity and incapacity were so great that he is now dismissed) to say that a Russian division, after burning some villages, "pitilessly killed *three* inoffensive women." There is no proof whatever of this fact, but the women may have been petroleuses or spies, or they may have fired at and killed Russian soldiers; and, after all, Turks who kill and torture women and children by the thousand should not be so squeamish about three women who were killed, but not tortured.

Our friend Safvet, who might appropriately be called "the Pasha of many Taels," a few days later narrates the awful and appalling fact that one inhabitant of a village, of which he does not even know the name, was killed in a skirmish, whilst five were taken prisoners, and that six other persons were afterwards slain, "whose corpses were afterwards subjected to horrible indignities;" but the Turks, instead of "tearing out the eyes" of corpses, pull them out of living men. Eight Turkish soldiers, he pretends, were afterwards beaten to death with sticks by the Russians, but this is not quite so painful or inhuman as the following fact, related by General Tchernayeff to M. Ristich:—

"The bodies of our wounded prisoners were found fastened to the ground by wooden pegs, their hands spread out, their feet and other parts of their bodies charred, their toes cut off, their stomachs mutilated by knife cuts, their countenances contracted by pain. The presence of the corpses of the Nizams prove that these atrocities are the work of regular troops."

The veracious Safvet (the same man who said at the Conference that he had not even seen the Andrassy Note, when it suited his purpose) adds that 1,500 families, which would be about 7,000 persons, from Soukhum Kale, who took refuge in the forests to

escape the barbarous treatment of the Russians, died of starvation. The Russians probably never knew of this emigration, nor where the people went; but they ought to be both omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent, and I suppose Safvet thinks they should have sent provisions for the 7,000 to the forests, and maintained them all till the conclusion of the war.

Safvet continues in another dispatch, when we have had a little time to digest the 7,000 victims, which was rather a large demand on our credulity, "Oustroudja and Kadisle have been plundered by the Cossacks, who massacred about thirty of the Mussulman inhabitants, without distinction of age or sex;" and subsequently, "*some* Cossacks . . . having come upon *some* Mussulmans . . . massacred them, without sparing the women and children." After the battues of the Turks in their Christian provinces, with all the delights of varied tortures, the slaughter of these probably imaginary victims, without any tortures, seems but tame.

Safvet should really get the *Daily Bellowgraph* correspondent to correct his telegrams, and, though they may not be true, they might at least be made consistent. On July 16th he says: "The inhabitants of Tems, near Tirnova, having taken refuge in the mosque at the approach of the enemy, were burnt alive within the walls. The enemy, having come upon 300 waggons filled with fugitive families, destroyed them with cannon shots, and then completed the work of extermination by massacring all, both men and women, that they could get hold of."

The reader will observe that the inhabitants were first of all burnt alive within the mosque; then they were apparently restored to life, I suppose, by a Mahometan miracle, and escaped in 300 waggons, which would probably suffice for the whole population before they had been burnt, and then the waggons, *filled* with fugitive families, were so cleverly destroyed by cannon shots that *all* of them remained to be afterwards massacred. This reminds me of an Irish story of a man who was accused of stealing a watch and, when placed on his defence, he said, first, he did not take it, and if he did he paid for it, and if he didn't it was of no value.

Vice-Consul Biliotte unmistakably intimates his opinion of the correspondent of a daily paper, in stating in reference to the reported death of the 1,500 families from starvation, "I had, a few days previously, heard the identical report, and *although my informant was an English officer*, on whose word all reliance could be placed, *still I did not feel justified, he being the correspondent of a daily paper, to communicate the news* to your Excellency (Mr. Layard) *before I received information on the subject also from other sources.*"

The Turkish commander at Utah Kilisse telegraphs :—"From the information received it has unhappily been ascertained that there were in the said church about ten corpses of Mussulmans and Christians, who had been killed some ten days before. . . . The Russians wounded the curé of the church, and, having put him in irons, wounded as he was, took him off with them."

This Turkish commander in some respects trumps even the practised Safvet, and his telegram is really creditable to a beginner in the art of fabrication. The Russians might possibly have killed some Mussulmans, but they never would have killed the Christians, nor wounded and carried off the curé.

The *Times* correspondent in Montenegro writes from Ostrog :—"Fort Rastrovatz, with a garrison of forty men, surrendered yesterday. The prisoners are well treated, and as soon as their fears of decapitation were quieted became very gay and contented, with no desire to return to the Turkish authorities. They are mostly Albanian Nizams, are unpaid, and were poorly fed."

The Turkish generals are such incapable and lazy dolts that the Sultan is obliged to employ as his commanders-in-chief renegade Christians—Omar Pasha in the Crimean war, and now Mehemet Pasha, a German.

The incautious Safvet on the 14th of July makes an admission which proves that the Montenegrins have never disgraced themselves to the full extent that some inventive writers have pretended. "*The Montenegrins* who mutilated their prisoners *always respected women and children.*" The mutilation of living prisoners here charged by Safvet is a wilful and malicious falsehood as is

shown by Consul Monson's reports, especially one in which he says, "*I am in a position to prove* that the Turkish prisoners during their detention in Montenegro were treated with truly admirable humanity and generosity."

Having now gone through the Parliamentary paper, I shall proceed to quote from other authorities what they think of the so-called Russian atrocities.

As to the alleged Russian atrocities in Bulgaria, I quote the following observations from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet :—"Among secondary, but still very weighty, reasons why we ought not to have left to the sole charge of Russia an European responsibility, was the high likelihood, to say the least, that in Bulgaria, at any rate, the operations of the war would be tainted with barbarity. It may have been observed that we have no trustworthy evidence to show that this contingency has been realised on the Russian side in the Armenian campaign; and, in that country, the war had not been preceded by any but the normal misconduct of the governing power. But, upon the south bank of the Danube, the land bristled with stinging and exasperating recollections. The Bulgarians are men, as I believe, of at any rate the average humanity of Christendom; but had they foregone every opportunity of retaliation after the frightful massacres of 1876, they would have been angels. For weeks past the Porte has published official accounts of cruelties inflicted on the Mahometan population; cruelties very far short of those which it had itself commanded and rewarded, but still utterly detestable. To these utterances, except by a few fanatics, little heed was given; for the world had learned, on conclusive evidence, that the arts of falsehood have received a portentous development in Turkey, and have become the very basis and mainspring, so to say, of Ottoman official speech. As late as on the 15th of July the correspondent of the *Daily News*—and the title is now one of just authority—declared his conviction that there had not then been a single case in Bulgaria of personal maltreatment of a Turkish civilian by a Russian soldier. I can hardly hope this is now the fact. While I have little fear that there has been, on the part of Russians, widely

extended cruelty, there must be among them, at least here and there, ruffians whom discipline will ill restrain; and we have also to bear in mind the diversity of races and civilizations in their army. The subject is one that calls for the closest attention. We have first to wait, as we waited last year, for a full exhibition of the facts; and then, without respect of persons, to estimate them as they deserve. Above all, we shall then have to observe, and honestly to appreciate, the conduct of the Russian Government in reference to proved barbarity. I have shown at large that the essence of the case of 1876 lies, not in the massacres themselves, but in the conduct of the Porte about the massacres; the falsehoods, the chicane, the mockery and perversion of justice, the denial of redress, the neglect and punishment of the good Mahometans, and finally the rewards and promotions of the bad, in pretty close proportions to their badness. If the Russian Government descends to the same guilt, I heartily hope it will be covered with the same, or more than the same infamy. But if it actively assists or boldly undertakes the detection of crime—if, above all, it inflicts prompt and condign punishment on the offenders, of whatever race or land they be—it will then have done all that such a woful case admits to clear its own character, and to vindicate the honour of Christian civilization."

The correspondent of the *Graphic*, in describing the pillage at Sistova by the Bulgarians, adds:—"In justice to the Russian soldiery we should state that they took no part in these wanton outrages, but, on the contrary, immediately directed their efforts to stop the pillage."

The *Illustrated London News* has a woodcut of the Russian General Zimmermann, who refused to accept the customary offer of bread and salt from the elders of Malchan, scolding the Bulgarians for destroying Turkish property, and of the Czar, with his own hands, distributing cigarettes to the Turkish prisoners.

From the *Daily News*:—"We do not blame Mr. Layard for telegraphing to Lord Derby a multitude of rumours, the truth of which he admits he has no means of ascertaining. One of the most prominent charges relates to the sinking of

some Turkish merchant vessels at Aidos and Amasra, and the cruel destruction of their defenceless, unresisting crews. According to the 'facts' as told in the dispatch to Musurus Pasha, torpedo launches had wantonly blown up three Turkish vessels without giving the sailors time or means to save their lives. The place, date, and circumstances of the affair were narrated, yet, according to our Consul-General at Odessa, the crews said to have perished were all landed on the Anatolian coast, or sent to Constantinople. . . . Our correspondent (with the Turkish army), who is near the scene of many of the alleged atrocities, and who is obviously no partisan of the former (the Russians and Bulgarians), chronicles no gross outrages committed by them. Their worst acts seem to be wrecking *the abandoned* Turkish quarters. He searched to little purpose in the reports for clear intimations as to the authority for the fouler charges. He found, as a rule, only vague, unsatisfactory references to 'trustworthy sources,' 'we hear,' 'it is stated,' or 'information was received.' . . . One of the few authorities whom he cites by name is the correspondent of a contemporary, which has been little distinguished by impartiality or accuracy of information. The reports, for the most part, are on hearsay and anonymous. The few telegrams from our Consuls do not speak of what they have seen. . . . Some of the charges are obviously unsusceptible of proof. . . . Moreover, 'the greater part of Turkey,' as Mr. Layard truly says, 'is in lamentable anarchy and disorder, and there is but little security for life and property.'"

The *Times* says: "Our telegraphic intelligence contains an amazing list of the atrocities, which, according to the Porte, have been perpetrated by the Russians and Bulgarians. The report, which is signed by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, is a model of arithmetical explicitness. . . . The total number of the victims in one day's report is 4,763, besides those burnt in the mosque! The Porte can scarcely be surprised to hear that such a report does not quite comply with those troublesome rules of legal evidence which are found necessary in Western society. . . . After investigating for weeks the atrocities committed by the Turks,

Mr. Baring failed to come within sight of the statistical accuracy which Aarifi Pasha has reached in a few days, at a distance of 300 or 400 miles from the scenes of the infamies which he records. A little evidence would have been a valuable addition to his arithmetical exactness. . . . It is difficult to ascertain how the Porte could have gained so exact a knowledge of the massacres in other villages. Those places are in the hands of the Russians. All the Turkish officials must have been driven away, and it is hard to believe that the Cossacks would have furnished exact evidence of their own barbarities. The mystery is increased by the fact that these atrocities have not been described by the newspaper correspondents in Bulgaria, although these gentlemen have written some very unflattering accounts of the *acts of pillage committed by the Bulgarians and the Russians in the deserted houses of the Turks.* . . It was not by vague reports or by the loose statements of Slavonic Committees that the indignation of this country was stirred against Turkey last year. Our own Consuls sent reports, which, although at first discredited as 'coffee-house babble,' turned out to be true. The American missionaries, the railway officials, and educated Bulgarians placed a mass of proofs before unofficial Englishmen and Sir Henry Elliott."

Although a British Consul has testified that the Turkish sailors whom the Turks asserted had been destroyed by the Russians are all alive and uninjured, the "West-end" are still incredulous, and they remind me of a story which O'Connell once told in the House of Commons. He said, "On one occasion I was counsel in Ireland for a man accused of murder. I produced but one witness, but that one witness would have secured the instant acquittal of the prisoner in any court in Europe; the witness was the man supposed to be murdered himself, yet the jury brought in a verdict of guilty," and this is precisely what the "West-end" are doing as regards Russia.

The disgraceful and insulting way in which Sir Arnold Kemball is treated by the Turks appears from the following paragraph from the *Times* correspondent:—"It is but a duty I owe to the English public that they should be informed of the very scant

courtesy our military *attaché* receives at the hands of the Turkish officers. Sir Arnold Kemball is too old a soldier, too tried a politician, and too deeply imbued with a sense of the extremely delicate nature of his mission, ever to let fall even a hint that he is dissatisfied with the treatment he receives; but it must, nevertheless, be galling to an officer of his position to be left without attendants, allowed to bivouack on the open ground, when even regimental officers carry tents, and to be not only kept in the dark as to the intentions of the commander-in-chief, but constantly misinformed as to the actual state of affairs. Attended by only his aide-de-camp and one Turkish orderly officer, Sir Arnold may be seen riding through the camp, making himself thoroughly acquainted with the real state of affairs; and, although attired in the uniform of a British general officer, he is rarely received with any marks of respect, and is still more rarely saluted by either officers or men; all day long in the saddle, at night sleeping on the bare ground, wrapped only in his cloak, sharing the rations of the Turkish soldier, and cheerfully putting up with privations that few of our generals would stand;" whilst as to their treatment of newspaper correspondents, I quote the Paris correspondent of the *Times*, who says, "Ahmed Ayud, the Turkish commander in Bulgaria, has expelled all the newspaper correspondents, and even the English and French military *attachés*, who have retired to Rasgrad;" and *Truth* informs us—

"The *Daily News* is coming to the front in its war correspondence. It has two correspondents with the Russian army in Bulgaria, each of whom has three aides-de-camp, who are themselves men of education, and able to collect news. Mr. Archibald Forbes, the well-known correspondent of the newspaper, crossed the Danube in the first boat. He wrote a telegraphic despatch of above 3,000 words, whilst standing in a swamp, which reached nearly up to his waist. This dispatch was carried over the river, and handed to a horseman, who rode with it to the nearest telegraph station. Besides these two principal correspondents, there are numerous others at all points where anything of interest is likely to occur. In Asia the *Daily News*

has four correspondents, and several in Turkey in Europe, who have to dodge about, and to conceal their occupation, because, were it known, they would immediately be turned out of the country. The Turkish authorities have taken it into their silly heads that they can bribe English newspapers to adopt the Turkish side, and to endorse Turkish lies, by only allowing the correspondents of pro-Turkish journals in the Empire. As the *Times* and the *Daily News* do not come under the category of such journals, the French viper, Blaque Bey, hunts down their correspondents, and when he does not dare to expel them, confiscates their telegrams and their letters. The details of the manœuvres of the correspondents of these two journals, by means of which they outwit the censorship of this renegade, would fill a volume. The system of the Turks is all the more foolish, because its consequence is, that no one believes a word of the telegrams and the letters published in pro-Turkish journals."

When the *Daily News* correspondent was ejected from Rustchuk, because the Turks do not approve of that journal, a Frenchman, who had resided some time in Turkey, was sent to the town, with directions to supply the place of the ejected one. So soon as the Turks learned what his mission was, he was arrested, taken to Constantinople, and imprisoned there. After a week of confinement, he managed to communicate with the French representative, who insisted upon his release. This was conceded with an ill grace, but he was ordered immediately to leave the country."

Colonel Brackenbury, the correspondent of the *Times*, M. Dick de Loulay, special correspondent of the *Monde Illustré* and *Moniteur Universel*, M. Lamothe, correspondent of the *Temps*, and M. Tellier, correspondent of the *Illustracion Espanole*, signed at Kesanlik, on July 21st, a declaration in the form of a Protocol, affirming that the Turkish regular troops had committed atrocities on the Russian wounded at the defence of the Shipka Pass on July 17th and 18th.

Colonel Wellesley says that he found twenty-seven wounded Mussulmans in a hospital in Biela carefully attended to by Russian

doctors and Russian ladies of the Red Cross. All these were found by the Russians in the neighbouring villages, and they one and all say *that they* (*the Mussulmans*) *were wounded by the Circassians* before the arrival of the Russians (*Daily News*, August 7th, 1877).

The *XIX. Siecle* of Paris says, "As for the atrocities of the Russians in Bulgaria, of which the English press make so great a noise, where the devil does it take them from? I am not aware of what the Russians may have done in Asia, at Ardahan, or at Bayazid; but I can affirm that on the banks of the Danube, from whence the Mussulmans—of whom the number is besides very limited—had in part emigrated, the Russians have respected those which remained and have treated as allies the Bulgarians and other Christians."

The *Times* correspondent further says, "When the tirailleurs came near the redoubt, pressing forward step by step, a large white flag was displayed, and signs were made by the Turks that they wished to surrender the redoubt without further fighting. At first the Russians doubted and hesitated to trust their enemy. But the white flag, which was advanced and waved, was so large a flag there could be no question as to its meaning. On that day, as on the day before, the gallant Major Liegnitz, of the Prussian staff, was with the skirmishers, not to fight, but to watch, and from his lips, confirming the story of the Russians, I have the following details. So confident were all in the evident purpose of the flag thus displayed, that he actually walked up to and entered into conversation with one of the Turks in the first line of skirmishers, and wished to go forward with those who passed on to receive the surrender of the fort, but was forbidden. As the men emerged from their cover as skirmishers and stood exposed and expectant, there came from the fort, first two or three shots, which might have been accidental, then one or two more, and, finally, at a given signal from both ends of the fort, a heavy volley, followed by a second. The tirailleurs recoiled for a few moments, but then recovered themselves and took the fort within a quarter of an hour. . . .

"This morning orders had been given for a renewal of the attempt by attacking the piece of road from both sides, and with the aid of artillery; but a flag of truce came in from the Turks, and the officer who bore it was commissioned by the Pasha commanding to say that he could resist no longer, being in want of bread and ammunition, and would march his men to the Russian camp, there to lay down their arms if the Russians would promise not to attack. Strangely enough, the traitors of the day before were trusted again, and time was given them to execute their promise. But not a man showed himself; and when General Gourko sent messengers up to ascertain the reason, it was found that these 'gentlemen' had pledged their military honour and broken the pledge. This and the abominable trick of the day before, worthy only of untutored savages, are enough to stamp with infamy the character of a nation whose Regular Army it was that did these things; but how are the horrible deeds they had further committed to be described? Can what we saw yesterday have been an ugly dream? No; it is only too terrible a reality. Let me only tell what the Staff saw as they rode up yesterday afternoon. Passing up the narrow winding road, with heaps of rough stones and boulders at every step, we came upon dead bodies of such as had fallen out of the power of the Turk. There they lay, with that expression fixed on their faces which came from their hearts at the moment when they fell. An officer told me of one case he had seen of a wounded Mussulman with smashed thigh lying on the ground. When the Russians came to give him help he writhed his body into a half-sitting position, then, with gnashing teeth and grin, like a savage animal, fired at and wounded an officer. In a moment Cossacks sprang forward and transfixed him with their lances, but the same savage expression of perfect rage and hatred remained on his face after death. His lips were drawn back over his teeth, his face wrinkled, his eyes, though dulled, yet wearing an expression of ferocity. But the dead killed in battle have often placid faces, for the warrior's mind has turned to softer thoughts before nature fixed the last expression. Presently we are met by men carrying downwards on a stretcher the headless

body of an officer, and it begins to be told that this is not a solitary example. On the top of the pass the whole truth is told. The Turk, that 'gentleman' of English drawing-rooms, regularly enrolled in the army of the Sultan, well-dressed and well-fed on the savings of the Bulgarians and on English money—this creature, led by regular officers, has mutilated every Russian soldier that fell into his hands, dead or alive. . . .

"Returning towards the other, or eastern flank of the position, we pass a group of Turkish wounded—some fifty or so—whose wounds are being dressed and cared for as if that group of heads had never been seen. The men look afraid—as well they may, for they cannot believe that the Russians are less barbarous than themselves. They are most distinctly men of the Regular Army, well fed, well clad, driven by no pangs of hunger to commit crime, leaner and finer men than the little tirailleurs. But like most of their race whom one meets here, a retreating forehead and small cranium, with wandering eyes, give the impression of ferocity and cunning. A few paces further on is a circle of Russians—officers and men—gazing, fascinated, at a spectacle within. There, at last, are the bodies collected together for examination; all headless, some cut limb from limb, some treated in a manner which is universally regarded as the deepest insult that can be paid to the body of a man alive or dead. But were these men alive or dead when they were thus treated? With regard to some there may be a doubt, but with regard to others no doubt. Here was to be seen a body with wounded finger dressed and the rest cut off ruthlessly perhaps in struggling with the knife. There lay what was a man, in an attitude showing plainly that he had striven to save his throat; near him was another with the red cross on his arm having, perhaps, dressed the wounded finger of the first-named; one in the terrible exhibition lay with bared belly, slashed across with knives, and showing that blood had run from the wounds; another had been cut limb from limb. A young and well-shaped form, with clearer skin than the rest, had been beheaded and otherwise shamefully mutilated—but there was not a single wound of any description on his body produced by regular warfare.

These are only instances. The proof was all too plain. There lay men who had been wounded or unwounded prisoners in the hands of the Turkish 'gentlemen,' who had foully murdered and mutilated them, showing thus that they are savages as cruel as any in Africa or India. And but a few paces distant the Russian medical men were dressing the wounds of these savages, and soldiers standing round guarded them from all evil, even the righteous indignation which filled their own breasts. This was not a scene in a theatre. No one knew that a correspondent would be there, but the effect was such as no sensational tableau could produce. On the one side civilization, rough if you will, but still civilization based on the precepts of Christianity; on the other side barbarism and the worse than bestial ferocity of cruel men. What purpose could be served by such diabolical mischief? They would not hold out a day longer for it or obtain better terms. It was the ferocity with the slyness of the monkey or the idiot.

"In the few communications which the obstacles placed in my way have enabled me to make to you, I ask your readers to bear witness that I have at least endeavoured to be impartial. If there had ever been a doubt that my path was to be a thorny one, it was soon removed. The *Times* having taken an independent line in criticising the conduct of the evildoers here, was, with another English journal, on the black books of the authorities, and everything which a petty and childish system of persecution could devise was done to render the performance of their duties difficult, if not impossible, for the representatives of both newspapers. Telegrams were handed back days after receipt, because a word had been erased or altered, or because what should have been French was English, because the Turkish was incorrect, because they had been addressed to a private individual when they were intended as press communications, because they were addressed to editors when only communications to private persons were allowed (the regulations being altered every few days), because they were inexpedient, and because they had been stopped 'by order.'

"For a day or two before I left for the front (remember, at the

Bey's suggestion) there had been a very brisk business doing in Cossack atrocities. Humane man that he is, Tevfik's soul was moved at the inhuman doings of the Muscovs, and both he and his other self, Selim Effendi, were indignantly anxious that the English public should immediately have full details of all the butcheries and other foul doings which the different commanders, who were too busy to tell him anything about the fighting, found time to telegraph in harrowing fulness. I was informed that both gentlemen were grieved that I did not avail myself of their permission to telegraph these sad facts, but for reasons which even now appear to me sufficient I politely but firmly refused to do so. More than that, my last words on leaving to my deputy were, 'Remember, no Cossack atrocities unless you see and talk with the victims.' This was well known in Shumla, some of my colleagues having commented upon my scepticism in the matter. Now, will it be credited that, my back being turned, and my educated substitute being forcibly got out of the way, the telegram which I enclose was given to the elderly gentleman who had been so strongly approved as an agent for me by the Bey, with injunctions to attach my name to it and send it off to you immediately. They put their official seal on it, as you will see, and the good-natured old soul ran towards the telegraph office for fear it would be late. On the way, however, he felt a little nervous about forging my name, and called in upon a friend of mine to ask if he thought I should like it. The result of the interview was that he, to please the authorities, pretended to send it, but to please me did not, and here it is :—

"TO AUDITOR, 'TIMES,' LONDON.

"Bulgars in Balkans risen and murdered Jatva and Dobnitcha population. At Tchaily, near Rasgrad, 200 refugees from Sistova, Mussulmen, murdered by Russians and Bulgarians. At Ostrancha and Costova all Mussulmen killed, including women and children, refugees from Armoutton, all massacred. In town itself eleven women and ten children. Whole population of Utch Destin massacred by Bulgars. Russians took whole population of Bechpinar prisoners, violating the women. "CONINGSBY.

When I wished to telegraph to you the fact that my deputy had

been arrested and my telegrams from the front had not reached you, the political agents blankly refused to allow me to communicate by telegraph at all; I might write. I did write a long letter—sixteen closely-worded pages, equal to two columns and a half; handed it in open, according to regulations, to be 'glanced at.' The same evening I received the following letter from Mr. Prior, special artist of the *Illustrated London News*:—

"Shumla, July 17, 1877.

"Dear Mr. ——,—I have not the slightest objection to give you in writing the information that I saw —— this evening reading and striking out passages from your letter to the *Times* at the house of Tevfik Bey. If you open that letter, which is now sealed with Tevfik Bey's seal, you will find that very long passages have been struck out. As I tell you, I was asked 'to be discreet,' and consider that I am so in being loyal to you, as we have travelled together.

"I am, dear Mr. ——, yours faithfully,

"MELTON PRIOR.

"Upon opening my letter upon its return to me officially sealed for the post, I found more than a fifth abstracted, cut away, and what was left had such extensive and thorough erasures that you would have thought I had taken leave of my wits to have sent you such an epistle. Every impartial criticism—in fact, everything which gave the letter any value—was so effectually inked out that it was impossible to read a word.

"Next I was credibly informed that my name had been attached to a sort of round robin or memorial to the world at large on the subject of the atrocities by Cossacks and Bulgarians, of which I had never even heard, the authorities well knowing that I was very dubious about such atrocities altogether, although I regret to say that since then I have had good evidence that some women and children have been wounded with lance thrusts; *but the victims who have come under my immediate notice admitted, under very sharp cross-examination, that the hurts were all got during the fight.* I hear of other cases at Rasgrad and elsewhere, but cannot speak for any but those at Shumla," and *Truth* tells us that "this official whittling was performed by no less a personage

than the Hon. W. Drummond, censor of war correspondence in the Turkish service, *and correspondent of more than one English journal ! ! !*"

It is evident from the foregoing evidence from English, German, French, and other correspondents, that the humanity of the Russians is equal to their valour, and that no army of any nationality has ever conducted itself better; and few would have acted with the same noble and generous self-restraint under the provocation of the dastardly and ferocious cruelty of those human hyænas, the Turks.

Even if the accusations against the Russians were true, we should recollect that in the Peninsula, and especially at Badajoz, the conduct of our own troops was not always irreproachable, and we should not lose sight of our conduct in suppressing the Jamaica rebellion and the Indian Mutiny, as well as to the Dyaks of Borneo. With reference to the French, who have always claimed to be at the head of civilized nations, the late Colonel Sir John Cowell Stepney, M.P., who was in the Coldstream Guards, says in his published Diary:—"Were it not disgusting by its irreverence, it would have been amusing to see the *tricks they* (the French) *played with their own dead*, stowing them away in all conceivable places, enclosing them in large chests, placing them upright, in full uniform, in the recesses of houses and convents, tying them on to the top of windmills with their arms in their hands, pointed as if levelled at those who advanced, and worse than all, throwing them down wells. . . While halting near the banks of the Alva, I found in a roofless house, which had been destroyed by the flames (by the French), a poor old man lying on his own threshold, shot through the body; a young woman, apparently *enceinte*, suspended by the neck to a beam, and a child of tender age lying at her feet with its throat cut. . . . Lord Wellington about this date wrote to Lord Liverpool as follows:—'I am concerned to be obliged to add to this account, that their conduct (that of the French) throughout this retreat has been marked by a barbarity seldom equalled, and never surpassed.' . . . The provost marshal

did his duty by hanging two British soldiers detected in the act of robbery."

The correspondent of the Turcophile *Cologne Gazette* writes from Kazanlik on the 21st July:—"Russian officers have related to me the acts of cruelty and atrocity committed by the Turks on the defenceless wounded. I must say that these deeds are perfectly true, since impartial correspondents, who have seen the corpses have entirely confirmed to me the assertions of the Russian officers."

The patriotic eagerness with which the Turks are ardently rushing to enlist in the Ottoman army is shown by the following letter in the *Times*, from "B.," dated from Ingatestone, Essex:—"I was in Jaffa on the 14th of July, and saw there 1,500 new recruits—the last reserve—who had been collected from the neighbouring towns and villages. *These men were driven to Jaffa manacled together in files of ten to twenty men. They daily curse the Sultan and his government.* A number of recruits escaped from their guards, but were recovered after a sharp fight, in which some were killed. . . ."

The Turcomaniacs, I may say on concluding this chapter, appear to say of the Turk what Montroud said of Talleyrand, "Il est impossible de ne pas aimer cet homme: il a tous les vices."

SOME REMARKS ON BARON HENRY DE WORMS' BOOK ON "ENGLAND'S POLICY IN THE EAST." (Fourth Edition.)

THE French have a proverb that "in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed are kings;" and in the Cimmerian ignorance which prevails in Western Europe on the Eastern Question I suppose one must not give way too much to a feeling of astonishment that so flimsy and prejudiced a book as that of Baron de Worms should have been actually translated into French and German, should have reached a fourth edition in English of, I believe, about 1,500 copies in all, and should have been lauded by the Turcophile critics to the skies.

Baron de Worms, the rejected Tory candidate for a constituency which apparently has made a "Sandwich" permanently distasteful to him, since he did not solicit it again (though he told the constituency, joking on his own name, that trodden Worms would turn again), is, I suppose, an Englishman as well as a Jew, for he speaks of "a free country like *ours*," "*our* fleet," &c.; but if so, he is precluded, I believe, by law, or at least by custom, from calling himself a baron without the permission of the Queen, which is seldom, if ever, given; and one is curious to learn what right he can have to the particle "de" before his name, unless indeed he is the hereditary feudal superior of the town of Worms, which possesses nearly 15,000 inhabitants. *Truth* tells us that the price of a Roman dukedom is about £2,500, but I suppose baronies are quoted low, especially in these hard times; and one wonders that Hebrew barons do not become as common as Frenchmen

decorated with the Legion of Honour. The eccentric Mr. Walrond, whose will was recently disputed, was a Spanish marquis, and I know of many other Englishmen who have foreign titles, but who content themselves with a simple Mr., and these mushroom financial barons without baronies should remember the lines which were current last season in London :—

Kings may grant titles,
Honour they can't;
A title without honour
Is a Baron Grant.

His book is merely a dull pamphlet (for, to quote an old pun, he is not a *Jew* d'esprit) of 91 pages, of one single chapter, which, if it was printed in the same type as my work, would occupy about 60 pages. The remainder of the book, other 94 pages, is mere padding, consisting of the following undigested materials, pitchforked into the appendix apparently at random :—1. The Treaty of Paris. 2. The Andrassy Note. 3. The Berlin Memorandum. 4. Lord Derby's Despatches. 5. Colonel Sir H. Havelock on the Importance of Constantinople, with the latter half against Turkey omitted. 6. Table of the Population, Trade, &c., of each of the Powers Concerned in the Eastern Question. 7. Table showing the Religious Creed and Population of each of the Nationalities of the Ottoman Empire. There is, besides, a notice to this fourth edition of eleven lines, a coloured map, and what the author calls an index, but which is, in fact, a repetition of the marginal titles, whereas an index should be alphabetical.

In short, the book is a device for making the public pay a considerable sum for what in reality would be a Jew's bargain at the smallest coin in the realm ; and this Jew's harp does not give forth one single melodious note.

It would require the same number of pages which Mr. Worms has taken to expose the numerous errors in fact and statistics of this volume, and the utter fallacy of his borrowed and often-refuted arguments, and I have only time, space, and inclination to remark upon the more prominent; indeed, to quote a well-

known saying, he seems to "have drawn upon his imagination for his facts, and upon his memory for his arguments."

This veracious and accurate author tells us that "our exports to the former country (Turkey) amounted last year to nearly £13,000,000, while to Russia they were only £3,100,000." Now the fact is, as appears by the "Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries for the Year 1876," which now lies before me, that the entire value of the exports of British, foreign, and colonial produce not only to Turkey properly so called, but to Wallachia and Moldavia, Egypt, Serbia, Tripoli, and Tunis also, was only £9,933,204, and to those parts of Turkey which are not tributary, but directly governed, only £6,379,962, or less than half what Mr. Worms pretends.

Again, our exports of British, foreign, and colonial products to Russia in the same year were no less than £8,635,655, being £2,255,693, or upwards of 35 per cent. more than to the directly governed portion of Turkey, and nearly three times as much as this author, with astounding recklessness, in his blind, ignorant, and foolish hatred of Russia, pretends.

In a succeeding passage our author tells us that Montenegro was "encouraged to make war upon their Suzerain;" but as appears by the Blue-books on the Turkish Question, Austria and most of the Great Powers have never recognised the suzerainty of the Porte over the chivalrous Montenegrins, who have for centuries resisted this preposterous claim.

Our author next favours us with his advice, not gratis, but for the small sum of five shillings, which is the price of his work, and which is also the usual fee of similar quack doctors, but not of the Jew chiropodists, who, when you have only one corn, pretend to extract several, which they conceal in their hand, and then charge as many guineas as they can extort; and he asks us "whether we should not wage a second Crimean War with the same objects as the first, *the Bulgarian atrocities notwithstanding?* . . That England should quietly look on while Russia is establishing herself in a position from which she may at any moment swoop

down upon our communications with India, would simply reduce our country to the position of a vassal of Russia, depending for its prosperity and comfort on the good pleasure of the Czar." These observations, the reader will observe, do not refer to the annexation of Constantinople, but to the establishment "of a species of police intervention in Turkey;" and if the Christians of Turkey were thus very inadequately protected from Turkish tyranny, England, it seems, may expect national bankruptcy, and our population will lose their roast beef and plum-pudding and other comforts. He adds, "England should make war against Russia directly the Russian troops cross the Danube." However, even our bungling Ministry have been wiser than our author, and have not converted the Danube into a Russian Rubicon at the instigation of this second Solomon.

Mr. Worms, after a tirade of abuse of the Russians, a little farther on, in one of his rare lucid moments, admits, "We know that the Russians as a nation do not yield to any in humane and philanthropic feelings."

We have afterwards an account of the conduct of the Russians in Poland, taken from the letters of the *Times* correspondent at Vienna, but these reports were merely from hearsay and chiefly from anonymous Polish sources, and are obviously grossly exaggerated, one illustration of which is that a magistrate rejoicing in the euphonious name of Swiderski says, "The Imperial troops, after killing four insurgents, whom we buried, murdering my daughter, and wounding my son-in-law, killed six servants of the household (their names are given). *The above were first castrated*, and then *twice* stabbed with bayonets." Now, it is not likely that all the six servants were men, and it would therefore seem that the women-servants and the daughter were subjected to the operation which it has been hitherto supposed can only be inflicted on an Abelard, and not on an Heloise. It is a pity that Swiderski, when shooting with this remarkably long bow, did not add that one of the men-servants who was with child was ripped up, which would have given a novel and finishing touch to the picture.

Even Bashi-Bazouks usually kill the men first, and if they

have had insufficient sport they then violate and kill the women; but Swiderski's (should it not be Swill-whisky, as he evidently sees double?) Russians *began*, according to his account, with bayoneting the daughter, and only wounded the son-in-law. In the first clause of this cock-and-bull story Swiderski says, "The soldiers entered, killed my daughter with *two* bayonet stabs, wounded with *two* shots my son-in-law, and began to plunder." In the second clause he tells a totally different story, for the soldiers, instead of beginning by killing the daughter, first began by killing four insurgents, and at the end they killed six servants, whom he had forgotten in the first account, whilst the plundering is suppressed and the castration is added. It will be observed, too, that by a singular coincidence every one of the persons killed was *twice* stabbed with a bayonet, none of them having been stabbed more or less than twice; and that whilst in the first clause the son-in-law is said to have been wounded with *two shots* (Swiderski is evidently partial to that number), the last clause says that he was *stabbed twice*.

Again, it is said the Russian soldiery *readily obeyed* the instructions they had received to bury the prisoners and the wounded with the dead, so that the Baron's authority—at the distance of about 350 miles as the crow flies from Vienna to Warsaw—knew not only everything that was done, but even the feelings and inclinations of the individual Russian soldiers. Like the Deity, he could read the heart.

The author shows his intimate acquaintance with the opinions and feelings of the Croatians, Bohemians, and Moravians by stating, contrary to the most convincing evidence, that they "have no sympathy with Russia;" whilst nothing can possibly exceed the enthusiasm which they have openly displayed in favour of that country, as appears from the articles quoted by me from the regular *Times* correspondents, and not from anonymous writers to that or any other journal.

He then says, "The suggestion that she (Italy) would take advantage of a war between Russia and Austria to seize the Trientino can only be regarded as a libel on the honesty and

sagacity of her statesmen. . . . Such an attempt would be a piece of base treachery that would bring down upon the new Italian kingdom the reprobation of Europe."

I hold the very opposite opinion; and if Austria foolishly and selfishly attempts by force of arms to prevent Russia from enfranchising the Christian serfs of Turkey, after having nobly emancipated her own, I trust Italy will make common cause with Russia, in which case she would be justly entitled, if victorious, to insist, as a condition of peace, not only on obtaining the Trientino, but all the Italian-speaking portion of Austria, including 633,000 souls; and Austria would run considerable danger of being deprived of her German provinces by Germany, who would no doubt side with Russia, especially if that country offered her the whole or a portion of the German-speaking provinces of Russia.

I have now to remark that the author of this precious volume speaks "of the so-called atrocities" in Bulgaria. Well, I am not surprised at such a description of these massacres from a Jew, for after all they sink into as utter insignificance in comparison with the atrocities committed by the children of Israel on their invasion of Palestine as a day's shooting on Salisbury Plain would be in comparison to one on Lord Stamford and Warrington's best preserves; and as Gibbon informs us, the Jews massacred no less than 460,000 individuals in Cyprus and Cyrene alone, besides, probably a much greater number in Egypt, or in all most likely upwards of a million of persons. This beats the Turks hollow.

I come now to Mr. Worms' Table of Population, &c., and I have only had time to undertake the dreary task of verifying his statistics respecting Russia and Turkey. All of those which I have thought it worth while to cite, with three exceptions, are grossly inaccurate; and I have no doubt that if any one had leisure to examine the rest they would prove equally apocryphal.

I now give Mr. Worms' statistics, for which he cites no authority, with the correct figures, taken from the *Almanac de Gotha* of this year.

STATISTICAL TABLE.

1.—The Statistics of the Russian Empire, from the *Almanac de Gotha*, are placed above, those of Mr. Worms below.*

	Population.	Revenue.	Imports.	Exports.
	86,586,000	£76,688,400	£64,817,500	£59,372,500
	86,586,000	£71,347,250	£58,925,000	£53,975,000
Diff.	Nil.	— £5,341,150	— £5,892,500	— £5,397,500

	Public Debt.	Army in Time of Peace.	Army in Time of War.	Total Navy.
	£244,074,883	565,277	1,358,557	196
	£301,197,498	837,853	1,789,571	124
Diff.	+ £57,122,615	+ 272,576	+ 431,014	— 72

It will be observed that whilst the revenue, exports, imports, and navy are enormously underrated, the debt and army are prodigiously overrated. It is quite clear that the figures have been got up to injure Russia without any regard to correctness.

2.—Statistics of the Turkish Empire from the same source.

	Population.	Revenue.	Imports.	Exports.
	24,833,400	£19,106,352	£18,500,000	£10,000,000
	28,500,000	£21,494,640	£18,500,000	£10,000,000
Diff.	+ 3,666,600	+ £2,388,288	Nil.	Nil.

	Public Debt.	Army in Time of Peace.	Army in Time of War.	Total Navy.
	£197,159,022	157,667	586,100	165
	£200,954,420	154,376	629,736	97
Diff.	+ £3,795,398	— 3,291	+ 43,636	— 68

As anyone might have anticipated, the statistics are cooked to favour Turkey, as the others were contrived to injure Russia; and as there is a balance of no less than £8,000,000 against Turkey on the exports and imports—whilst Turkey does not, like England,

* The Rouble is taken at 2/9, which has been the average for the last ten years, whilst it varies in exchange from 2/ to 3/2 $\frac{3}{64}$.

buy any considerable amount of foreign bonds, &c.—or nearly one-half the whole, it is clear that she is on the road to financial ruin.

It would be a waste of my own and my readers' time to analyze the whole or even any considerable portion of these ludicrously inaccurate statistics, but I will select a few as specimens.

Mr. Worms estimates the Servians at 3,027,067 (no round numbers here), whilst the fact is, according to the *Almanac de Gotha*, there are only 1,871,800; he fixes the number of the Bulgarians at 4,800,000, whilst the same authority says 1,860,500; and the Greeks at 2,000,000, whilst Mr. Bianconi states that there are 6,600,000.

Mr. Worms appends to his book (for I cannot call his specious romance a work) some of the opinions which the press have given respecting it.

The *Morning Post* is most enthusiastic, for it calls the book "a perfect handbook to the question of the day, which should be in the hands of everybody. . . . Its pages contain not only valuable arguments and excellent suggestions, but are a perfect storehouse of information culled from books, diplomatic documents, and newspapers. . . . In a word, all who wish to make themselves masters of the political situation ought to study and keep by them this valuable and ably written compendium." Now I have already shown that the imagination can hardly conceive greater statistical inaccuracy than characterises this book; but as Jenkins, the oracle of the fashionable world, says that Mr. Worms has produced a "perfect" handbook in what is equal to 60 pages of my work, whilst with the utmost possible condensation I have been unable to do so in upwards of 500 pages, I may mention that the only individuals and works whose words he very briefly quotes are the following—Mr. Ashworth, Freeman, Lord Derby, Mr. Forster, Mr. Gladstone, the *Times*, Schuyler, Kauffman, Golovatchef, the Nabat,* Captain Burnaby, Mr. Lowe, Lord Palmerston, the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, the Treaty of Paris, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Mr. Cyrus Hamlin, the *Manchester*

* Query, the father of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin, returned to earth in the shape of the "Wandering Jew."

Guardian, General Fadeef, Swiderski, and Sir H. Havelock, being 22 authorities in all, whilst I have quoted about 280; and the only additional names which are even mentioned in the text are Mr. Baker, Mr. Bright, Mr. Baring, Sir A. Buchanan, Count Beust, Count Schouvaloff, Sultan Mourad, Napoleon III., Lord Odo Russell, Lord Beaconsfield, the Pope, Consul Holmes, Dr. Cumming, Sir A. Loftus, and Sir H. Elliott, being 15 in all. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, after the intense appreciation of the *Post*, rather damns our author with faint praise; but the *Globe*, which turned its coat some years ago, says "it is a work which fairly ranks high among the best that have appeared on the Eastern Question;" whilst *Lloyd's Paper* talks of this pamphlet as "a solid volume;" the *Hornet*, perhaps a descendant of those which drove two kings of the Amorites out of Palestine, calls it "a splendid defence of the policy of the Government, full of new and instructive information;" and the *Whitehall Review* calls it "*the most complete* handbook and guide to the Eastern Question." If this is true, the Russians, whatever they may think of their friends, are most fortunate in having the feeblest opponent who could possibly be found, and the blows our author administers are as little injurious to them as those which are administered by clowns at a fair with bladders full of wind. In short, as in a recent song, our author seems to sing, "I'll strike you with a feather;" indeed, the blows are scarcely so hard as those which a better-selected feather than his goose-quill might inflict.

O ye descendants of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, if this trumpery book is all you can produce in support of that Anti-Christian cause to which you have always entertained such inveterate and uncompromising hostility, the Pro-Christian and Russophile party have nothing whatever to fear; and O ye already quoted incapable, ignorant, prejudiced, and pretentious critics, go to school and learn geography and statistics before you presume to discuss the Eastern Question again! As far as I am concerned, as you have praised this Worms' England's Policy, I hope you will abuse my Defence of Russia, for I regard "your praise as censure, and your censure praise." I can imagine

that when a work so ridiculously puffed as that which I am criticizing appeared in Russia, the Czar must have trembled, and been inclined to sue for terms, fearing that if he performed so base and immoral an act as freeing the Christians in Turkey, for which no vermifuge would avail, like Herod, he might be eaten with Worms till he died, and that after death he would be sent to that place where their Worms die not, and their fire is not quenched.

LORD R. MONTAGU'S "FOREIGN POLICY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION."

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, after being a considerable time in labour, has been confined of a work called "Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question." Until his book appeared the public was not aware that "*thirty-eight generations of Christians have quarrelled and hated and rustled off into eternity.*" Surely a large majority of Christians do not quarrel, but agree to differ, and do not hate each other, especially those of their own creed, though they may look with pity or contempt on those who hold opposite opinions to their own. Hitherto one was under the impression that the majority of Christians die noiselessly, but where Lord Robert or his friends have been present, it appears that in the great majority of instances there has been a rustling noise which I wish he had more particularly described.

We are then told that "Russia claims to found the great empire of the Slavonic race which spreads from the Elbe almost to the Himalayas and from the *gelid* sea of the north to the sultry Persian Gulf—a Pan-Slavonic Empire of 550,000,000 souls, with its centre in Constantinople."

Now, the fact is that the Russian Government has never been in favour of Pan-Slavism, nor of conquests towards what Lord Robert has christened the *gelid* sea, and which perhaps, on account of the number of a transparent fish he has seen there, he calls jelly-ed.

As to figures, Lord Robert has completely trumped Baron Henry de Worms in portentous ignorance and exaggeration, for

a Pan-Slavonic Empire would include, as he will find on looking at Haydn's "Dictionary of Dates," page 663, only 90,365,633 Slavonians in Europe, besides some in Asia, whilst this master of the long bow estimates them at 550,000,000, or about half the population of the globe; in fact, if we add the population of Japan, Siam, Burmah, the Chinese Empire, and India to Lord Robert's imaginary Slavonic Empire, and deduct the total, which is about 1,238,000,000, from the entire population of the globe, which is 1,228,000,000, there will remain for the other races, populations, and nations of Europe, and for the whole of Asia, Africa, America, and Australasia, 10,000,000 *less than nothing!*

We are next informed that the Pope ought to be the "supreme interpreter of the moral law" between nations, and "from his decision there can be no appeal." I should doubt if the Slavonic or Chinese Empires, when they have swallowed up the other nations of the world, would be willing to accept the Pope as supreme judge, but if they did, after the world had been thus divided, his duties would be comparatively easy.

I trust the reader, if he is not already asleep, will lend me his ears, or rather his eyes and understanding, while I quote the following, which I promise him shall be one of the last specimens of Lord Robert's bathos and rhodomontade:—

"Events never happen, they are done (*sic*). [The reader who has paid 14s. for this unique work will, perhaps, consider himself done.] Events are the effects of mind. [The fire of London, for instance, may have been caused by the operation of the mind of the reigning Pope brooding over the heretical state of England.] It is a change of maxims which produces a new course of conduct. [This seems rather a truism, for if our opinions are changed, it is probable our course will be altered; for instance, when Lord Robert Montagu became convinced of the errors of Conservatism and Protestantism, he very naturally crossed the floor of the House and became a pervert.] National sympathies, expressed though they be in the droning of platforms and twaddle of quidnuncs, have nothing to do with that which is done."

Until the world was enlightened by Lord Robert, we had supposed that national sympathies and antipathies had a great deal to do with events. For instance, when Belgium was fighting for its independence against Holland, France illustrated the truth of this paradoxical statement by sending an army to help the Belgians, and now Russia is incurring a colossal debt and sacrificing tens of thousands of lives to liberate the Christians of Turkey from the intolerable yoke of the Ottomans. I quite admit, however, that if Lord Robert means himself as one of the individuals alluded to in the "droning of platforms and twaddle of quidnuncs," what he said or wrote would "have nothing to do with what is done;" on the contrary, what is done would most certainly be the very reverse of what he recommended.

Here comes an enigma almost as inexplicable as the Sphinx: "The secret will and the veiled thoughts of a few men unsuspected in their aims and unknown as to their power, are the causes of every historical movement. There is a multitude throughout all nations, who form a secret band of diplomatists and warriors, and who are strictly united in carrying out the subversive aims which these men in secret devise." This momentous sentence—this Socratic utterance—contains an original discovery made by Lord Robert, on which the fate not only of England, but of the world depends. How strange that 658 members sitting on the same benches of the House of Commons have, in their blindness, not even yet discovered in the person of Lord Robert a guide, a prophet, and the saviour of society.

Lord Robert can fathom the secret will, and unmask the veiled thoughts of those who are at the same time "a few men," and "a multitude," and "a secret band" of diplomatists and warriors who are banded together to carry out their subversive schemes. The world has hitherto doubted whether secrets of any kind known to several men can be kept inviolate, and one would like to know whether it is through spiritualism or by what other means that Lord Robert has obtained exclusive information, so "important, if true." I would fain hope that, in pity towards his countrymen, though they are heretics in his opinion, he will reveal

the names of some of the "multitude of diplomatists and warriors" who are the wire pullers of society. We had thought in our ignorance that such men as Napoleon, Bismarck, Peel, and Gladstone had some trifling influence on the course of events; but it appears we are mistaken, and it is hard, ungenerous, and unpatriotic to keep us in ignorance of the volcano on which we are standing, the pitfall from which Lord Robert alone can save us.

Is it really possible that the author of this ultramontane and foolish rhapsody can suppose that any sane man will give fourteen shillings for such trash? If there was in England, as in France, a *conseil de famille* in his case, and I was a member, I have no doubt as to the course I should pursue. His book reminds me of an amusing passage in a work of the late witty Captain Marryat, called "How to Write a Fashionable Novel." Arthur Ansard is forced to write to pay his tailor, and his friend Barnstaple assists him thus: "The Honourable Augustus Bouverie no sooner perceived himself alone than he felt the dark shades of melancholy ascending and brooding over his mind, enveloping his throbbing heart in their—their adamantine chains. Yielding to this overwhelming force, he thus exclaimed, 'Such is life! We require but one flower and we are offered noisome thousands; refused that we wish, we live in loathing of that not worthy to be received. Mourners from our cradle to our grave, we utter the shrill cry at our birth, and we sink into oblivion with the faint wail of terror. Why then should we ever commit the folly to be happy? ("Arthur, hang me, that is a poser!") Conviction astonishes and torments; destiny prescribes and falsifies; attraction drives us away, humiliation supports our energies. Thus do we recede into the present and shudder at the elysium of posterity.' 'Arthur, I have written all this down, but I cannot understand, upon my soul, one word of it.' Barnstaple: 'If you had understood one syllable, that syllable I should have erased.'"

In the case of Lord Robert's book there is no fear that from such a cause any syllable would require to be erased.

"THE JEWS THE IMPLACABLE FOES OF THE CHRISTIANS."

CAPEFIGUE tells us that Napoleon complained that the English press did him more harm than all the armies of Europe; and most unfortunately, by reckless puffing, by unprecedented mendacity, an unlimited command of money, and by other unscrupulous means, the Jews have contrived (often under changed or assumed names of Christian sound) to monopolise a very large portion of the newspapers, not only of England but of Europe. These Jews are wolves in sheeps' clothing. Roman Catholics, Greeks, and professors of other religions do not degrade themselves by owning and editing newspapers ostensibly not only Christian but Protestant; but the "Wandering Jew" will do any mortal thing for a consideration.

As it is quite evident that the nucleus of the Turcophile party and its most rabid element consists of the race of Shylock, and that it will be no fault of theirs if the British nation is not hounded on to a dangerous and disgraceful war, without allies, with our oldest and best ally, Russia, in aid of the unspeakable Turks, on the pretence, not of justice—for what are justice and mercy to Shylocks?—but of imaginary British interests, I now proceed, lance in rest and vizor up, to tilt at the irrepressible Jews past and present.

Now that morally I draw the sword against them I fling away my scabbard; I pass the Rubicon, and burn my ships *vestigia nulla retrorsum;* and, as I shall give them no quarter, I ask and expect none in return.

I have already in another chapter severely criticised Baron Henry De Worms' book on (the Jews' notion of) "England's Policy in the East," which simply means a war with Russia to avenge the real or fancied injuries of the Jewish race, on the convenient principle that we should find the blood and money—or, rather, borrow the latter from these monopolist usurers,—and that they should reap all the profit on the footing of heads I win, tails you lose. Mr. Worms, in his book, which palms off on the reader mosaic gold instead of the sterling metal, but which is perhaps after all "worth a Jew's eye," tells us that there are three millions of Jews in Russia; and he complains that only a very small number are allowed to settle in St. Petersburg—that they are not allowed to own land, and of various other grievances. The baron is apparently fond of round numbers, for he has added nearly a quarter of a million, or ten per cent., to the real numbers of the Jews in the Russian empire; but to people accustomed to usury at 100 to 200 per cent., as appears from the authority I have already quoted to be the case in Turkey, a trifling exaggeration of a quarter of a million is hardly worth mentioning.

As the whole number of Jews throughout the world, according to Balbi, is only six millions, I must say I heartily condole with Russia in having nearly half that unsocial and undesirable race in their, in this respect, unfortunate empire, for the fair share with which they might expect to be afflicted, in proportion to the population of the globe, would be only about 400,000, so that they have more than seven times as much as their just Jewish burden; whilst in Turkey in Europe, where, our author tells us, the Jews receive "the contemptuous toleration of the Turk"—like Maw-*Worms*, they apparently like to be despised—out of a population of 8,477,214, only 75,165 are Jews; so that it seems that where they say they are oppressed they have increased so as to form one twenty-seventh of the Russian population, and where they are leniently treated they form only 1 in 113; consequently either oppression suits them better than toleration, or the story of their oppression is false.

I certainly do not wonder that Russia, seeing that the Jewish flood mounts so high, under present circumstances does not afford that nationality any further encouragement, and that they especially admit but few money-lenders into St. Petersburg to ruin their upper classes, and prevent them from acquiring land, lest, as in the case of England in the time of Roman Catholicism, an enormous proportion of the land falls into their hands, and the poor peasantry are financially bled to death.

To enable the reader to judge what sort of a people the Jews really are, I will now give a slight sketch of their career from the earliest period to the present time.

In reading Genesis, one is surprised to observe that Abraham, with more discretion than courage, told King Abimelech that Sarah was his sister and not his wife (and Isaac adopted the same course), the result being that the king took Sarah as his wife, Abraham thus ensuring his own dishonour. Then we have the story of Jacob taking advantage of his brother's hunger to extort from him his birthright, and afterwards, with his mother's assistance, defrauding him of his blessing. Jacob then cheated his father-in-law out of his sheep, and went off with his household gods. He, however, does not seem to have been a connoisseur in the female sex, since when Laban brought Leah, who apparently was ill-favoured and had sore eyes, to Jacob as his wife, he did not find out that she was not the attractive Rachel till next morning, and Rachel seems to have been very accommodating and free from jealousy, since she handed over Bilhah to Jacob as his concubine, whilst Leah bribed him to be with her by a present of her son's mandrakes.

We have afterwards an abominable act of cruelty and treachery committed by Jacob's sons, Simeon and Levi, towards the Hivites. Shechem had seduced Dinah, daughter of Jacob, and though he was willing to marry her, they induced the Hivites to circumcise themselves, and when they were sore, they killed them all ruthlessly and stole all their goods.

Reuben seduced his father's concubine, and Judah had two sons by his daughter-in-law.

All the sons of Jacob, except Reuben, wished to slay Joseph, but their Israelitish avarice prevailing over their blood-thirstiness, they sold him into slavery in Egypt. As to Joseph, he does not seem to have been remarkable for affection for his old father—who was only distant a four days' journey (I have travelled the distance myself on a camel in that time), and who was evidently devotedly attached to him—since for twenty years he never sent to inquire after him, or even told him that he was alive, and left his blind father a prey to the most agonizing grief.

When the years of famine came in Egypt, Joseph, like a true Shylock, took the whole of the money of the Egyptians, then their cattle, and lastly their lands; and this is hardly compensated by his conduct in the affair of Potiphar's wife, who very likely was not tempting, and perhaps was even repulsive.

We now come to the blessing bestowed on his sons by Jacob, in the course of which he compliments Issachar by telling him that he is "a strong ass," whilst "Dan shall be a serpent in the way, an adder in the path;" and one cannot resist the evidence which points to the conclusion that there must have been an enormous number of marriages between the tribes of Issachar and Dan and the tribe of Judah; and one is at a loss to guess which of these alliances was most frequent, in other words, whether the asinine or serpentine types most prevail among the Jews.

The Israelites, who are always complaining of oppression, do not seem to have been so badly off in Egypt, since at the time of the Exodus they took away "flocks and herds, even very much cattle," and the good-natured Egyptians were silly enough to lend them "jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment," which the Israelites wilfully stole, and we are afterwards told that they wished to return, and regretted not the dry bread and hard fare, but "wept for the flesh-pots of Egypt," and Dathan and Abiram spoke of Egypt as a land flowing with milk and honey.

I come now to consider some of the enactments of the cere-

monial law by which the "Peculiar People" are still bound. If a man is lame, blind, or mutilated in a particular way, from no fault of his own, he is excluded from the congregation. If money is lent to a poor person, no interest is to be charged. Unless one is much mistaken, the Jews entirely disregard this precept. The sacrifices were to be performed by Aaron and his sons, morning and evening, *for ever*. This is not done by the Jews either in Jerusalem or anywhere else, though neither Turkish or English law prevent it, so I suppose the present century in their opinion is beyond the period meant as "for ever." Then, the males were to go up to Jerusalem so many times a year, but even the wealthiest and strongest of the Jews seldom if ever go there.

The Jews are commanded to eat no fat, and of course no lard, dripping, or gravy, and to carry out this injunction it would be necessary for the rich Jews to dismiss their French cooks and have cooks of their own persuasion.

Moses, we are told, sprinkled Aaron and his sons with oil and blood, which must have had rather an unpleasant appearance, and I propose to visit a synagogue to see if this is still done.

Aaron, who made a golden calf, and induced the Israelites to dance before it stark naked, seems to our modern ideas rather an unsuitable choice for a High Priest, and certainly if the Archbishop of Canterbury was to act in the same way, he would not only lose his archbishopric, but would be driven for ever with ignominy from the Church.

The Israelites are further told that a garment or a house may be infected with leprosy, and if after being closed for seven days the leprous spots had spread they were to destroy the garment or house. Do they observe this regulation?

Then the 10th, 15th, and 23rd days of the seventh month were to be kept *for ever* as sabbaths, and there was to be a sabbatical year, but this law does not seem to suit the present generation of Jews, nor the regulation that they should not wear dresses containing a mixture of linen and woollen, and to put fringes of blue ribbon on their garments *for ever*.

When the Jews plant fruit trees, the fruit for the first three years is to be considered uncircumcised, and shall not be eaten in the fourth year; and this being so, anyone might go down to any Jewish country seat, and have an abundant supply of delicious fruit. The Jews are again told to cut boughs from trees, and dwell in booths seven days; but I have never observed any of them following out this precept.

In the seventh year they were not only not to sow or prune the vineyard, but the grapes were to be for the stranger, so that any poor person who requires the grape cure can easily try it gratuitously; and I hope, unless the grapes are sour, they will send me some in return for my writing this laudatory chapter.

The Israelites are further prohibited from lending money on usury, that is at interest. How then do they justify the fact that they are the most notorious usurers in the world?

The Israelites, however, are allowed to eat locusts, beetles, and grasshoppers, and John the Baptist seems to have been particularly fond of the first of these. As there seems to be a redundant and miserable population of Jews in Russia, the Czar might humanely export a large number to America to grow fat on the Colorado beetles, which are inexhaustible, and the farmers there would certainly make them welcome for that purpose at any rate.

In Numbers viii. we learn that all the gold and silver offered by about two and a-half millions of Israelites to the Lord at the dedication of the altar by Moses was only £510, or less than one-fifth of a farthing each, so that they can hardly be considered to have been then very liberal or pious.

When the Israelites, under Moses, conquered the Midianites—one of whom Moses had married—without the loss of one man, he ordered them, after slaughtering all the adults, to kill all the male children and all the women who were not virgins, which was done.

It appears that the Israelites in the wilderness did not pay much respect to the Mosaic law, since, from Joshua v. 2, none of the Israelites who were born during the forty years they

wandered in the wilderness were circumcised; but Joshua caused this painful and dangerous operation to be performed on the whole of the males.

In the appalling history of the Israelites, as related in the Old Testament, we learn that in a very brief period they destroyed no less than thirty-one nations with their kings, exterminating men, women, and children, and even destroying the houses, which they might have occupied themselves, and in many cases even the cattle and sheep, and the very fruits of the earth.

Their barbarities, however, were not perpetrated solely on the ancient inhabitants of the land, who had never done them any wrong, but even on their own countrymen, for we read that the Gileadites killed 42,000 flying Ephraimites, merely because they said, "Ye Gileadites are fugitives of Ephraim among the Ephraimites and among the Manassites."

And, again, to quote only one more among innumerable examples, we are told that a certain Levite took a concubine, who was a woman of bad character, whom he, however, valued apparently all the more, and went after her when she had deserted him to bring her home from her father's house, where she was. They seem to have had a very pleasant time of it at the residence of the concubine's father, who invited them to "lodge here that thine heart may be merry." The Levite having taken a lodging in Gibeah, "the men of that city" beset the house, desiring to commit an unnatural crime on the Levite; and as not one of the men of the city is excepted, this vice must have been very general, not to say universal, in Israel. To avoid this outrage the man of the house obligingly offered his virgin daughter and the concubine of his guest as prostitutes, "but the men would not hearken to him;" so the Levite took his concubine and with cowardly cruelty brought her forth unto them, "and they knew her and abused her all the night until the morning." When the man came to his house he showed his affection for his concubine and his humanity thus: "he took a knife and laid hold on his concubine and divided her, together with her bones, into twelve pieces, and sent her unto all the coasts of Israel." When she was immoral

of her own accord he appr[illegible] to submit to violation, he kil[illegible] having been summoned by th[illegible] the people of Gibeah to be all[illegible] time would not have permitted [illegible] night and the time "when the da[illegible] were numerous enough to send 700 *choic[illegible]* besides, one would suppose, a much larger [illegible] who were, as is usual, right-handed, and those wh[illegible] and having refused to permit so excessive a punis[illegible] than 400,000 exactly, without any odd numbers, [illegible] battle against 26,700 Benjamites, which appears [illegible] rather an unncessary force—like using a hammer [illegible] egg. However, the Benjamites, at the end of th[illegible] battle, gained a complete victory, and destroyed [illegible] ground" of the Israelites that day twenty a[illegible] men. The second day Benjamin destroye[illegible] ground" eighteen thousand men; a[illegible] so that I suppose others, such as camp[illegible] who did not draw the sword. Thus in two days the [illegible] had killed 40,000 men exactly, besides camp followers, without any odd fractions of a thousand, being half as ma[illegible] again as their total numbers.

The third day the children of Israel at last were victorious over the plucky Benjamites, and killed no less than 25,000 men, whilst 600 fled into the wilderness; consequently they could only have lost, at the utmost, 1,000 men in fighting against and killing 40,000 men on the two first days. Not content with the pretty severe lesson they had given the Benjamites, "*the men of Israel turned again upon the children of Benjamin, and smote them with the edge of the sword, as well the men of every city, as the beast, and all that came to hand; also they set on fire all the cities that they came to.*" As the Israelites found that the[illegible] came none to the camp to massacre the Benjamites f[illegible] Jabesh-Gilead, they utterly destroyed the whole of the in[illegible] tants of that city, saving only 400 virgins; but for some i[illegible]

themselves bound to extermi-
ney saved the 600, who were on
them to commit another rape of
of Shiloh to get wives, which the
ost the whole of the Israelites were
the idolatrous worship of Baal and
the time of Ahab the Lord said, "*I have*
and in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed
, and every mouth which hath not kissed him."
space will not permit me to make many
his part of Jewish history, but one can
l conduct of Jephthah, in murdering hi
account of a foolish and wicked vow, w
violate, but to perform; the treachero
ife of Heber the Kenite, who murd
it was her duty to protect if she ch
murder of King Eglon
id, who caused U
, the widow of a Hitti
aw; and that of Solomon (who also ma
daughter of Pharaoh, King of Egypt), of wh
nd few traces in any of the books which are att
which should contain 3,000 proverbs and 1,00
who strangely enough wondered at "the way of
maid," since with doubtful wisdom he encumbered
a harem of 700 wives and 300 concubines, most
not one of whom apparently was a maid, or why d

* It is strange that chapter x. of Proverbs begins with th
Proverbs of Solomon," as if the preceding nine chapters wer
though they contain those most generally read. Chapter xxx., a
the words of Agur, the son of Jakeh. Chapters xxv. to xxx. a
Solomon, which were not copied out till the reign of Hezekiah
xi. contains the words of King Lemuel, who must have b
arch. It is remarkable that Solomon says, "All the breth
te him, how much more do his friends go far from him?"
charity and family affection did not exist among the Israe
that "the plowing of the wicked is sin," and it is no doubt

tain this wonder? and as his duty of marriage to each wife was not diminished, his obligations exceeded the labours of Hercules.

Abijah mercilessly slew half a million of the Israelites, whi is about two hundred times the number of English slain a ch famous battle of Waterloo; and Pekah, the King of ween returned the compliment by slaying 120,000 of the men of l who

I now propose to consider the conduct of the Jews anded Saviour, from a Jewish point of view. All dispassionate en men including those who reject Christianity, must admit tha chosen, of Christ, even if He is considered as a mere man ment, no less that has ever illustrated humanity. He went abo came up to do healing all manner of diseases, and uttering the at first sight and sublime precepts of morality and religion whi to break an been uttered; and even the Jews themselves were s first day's by His unparalleled merits that when H rode into own to the "a very great multitude spread their in thousand others cut down branches from the trees to the way. *And the multitudes* that went sword," cried, Hosanna to the Son of David, destroye in the name of the Lord! Hosanna it He was come unto Jerusalem Who is this? And the *multitude s* of Nazareth of Galilee." And *Jerusalem and all Judæa* went out baptized confessing their sin Christ was the Messiah. They or else, if John falsely asserted t

should be informed that, "Where no woo "the earth is disquieted for an odious wom that Solomon had the worst possible opi vii. 27, 28, "Behold, this have I fou one, to find out the account: which ye man among a thousand have I found; b found." A race of men which contair not a single good woman in its entire f very bottom of the scale of humanity.

aptized by him? So that it is false to say that the cognized Christ as the Messiah.

rwards Christ irritated the Jews by telling them le the Temple "a den of thieves," reminding hets, whom they professed to venerate, had e process of killing and stoning. He also religious pretences of the Pharisees and dows' houses, and for a pretence make compass sea and land to make one made ye make him tenfold more a ves. . . Ye shut up the kingdom r ye neither go in yourselves nor suffer g to go in. . . Ye fools and blind. which strain at a gnat and swallow a ike unto whited sepulchres, . . full o all uncleanness. . . Ye serpents, w can you escape from the damnation ances of eternal salvation seem infini- Book of Revelation says that only h were "sealed."

e and other home truths, bribed and this villain treacherously did re Him at night for fear of the fore Caiaphas, the High Priest, number of witnesses to swear of them agreed together, and then, with an utter disregard is considered fair play, adjures e Christ, and on His stating this to death, and then spit upon and according to the opinion of the t least He was a benevolent and r even to Howard the Philan- n executed in any other country ad imagined himself, as others cially if, as in the case of Jesus,

He never obtruded His claims to the Messiahship, but only mentioned them when urged to do so.

That the trial of Jesus was not only a mockery of justice, but even a violation of the Draconian Jewish law, appears from what Mr. Innes, in his "Trial of Jesus Christ," in the *Contemporary Review*, remarks:—"We read in the oral law the saying of Eleazar, the son of Azarias, that 'the Sanhedrin, which so often as once in seven years condemns a man to death, is a slaughterhouse.'" Mishna treatise Mackboth.*

Yet the Jews not only condemned but executed Jesus for doing good, and two thieves for mere stealing, in one day. The oral law which existed in the time of Caiaphas is precisely the same as that which was afterwards, about A.D. 200, reduced to writing in the Mishna. Dupin, the great French advocate, says that "Annas was not a magistrate, and certainly that would add to the irregularity of interrogating the accused." The Mishna says, "The latter (capital trials) are commenced only in the day time, and must also be concluded during the day. . . They may be concluded on that day if there is a sentence of acquittal, but *must* be postponed to a second day if there is a condemnation. And for this reason capital trials are not held on the day before a Sabbath or feast-day." The crucifixion of Jesus took place, as has scarcely ever been doubted, on the Friday, the day before a Sabbath, which was also a high-day, and the meeting of the Council took place on the same Friday morning. Such a meeting on such a day was forbidden. . . In no case was such a rule so absolutely necessary to justice as when the accused, arrested after nightfall, had been put upon his trial by daybreak, without the least opportunity of summoning witnesses for his defence. One of the strangest sights the world has ever seen must have been the adjuration or solemn address to the witnesses who came to speak against the life of Jesus, by the magistrate, who had, no doubt with perfect sincerity, held it expedient that one man should die for the people—(they had got Barabbas, the robber, to execute, but preferred the luxury of murdering Christ). The evidence is overwhelming that at repeated meetings of what the Fourth

Gospel even calls a Council, and which may have been formal meetings of the acting committee of that body, the suppression, and, if need be, the death of Jesus, had been resolved on. As to the lawfulness of the High Priest's adjuration to Jesus, and the consequent sentence to death, Maimonides says, "Our law condemns no one to death upon his own confession;" and Bartenora states, "It is a fundamental principle with us that no one can damage himself by what he says in judgment."

Christ is then brought before Pilate, the Roman Governor, who acquitted Him, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it," but wickedly and weakly handed Him over to the cruel and bloodthirsty Jews, who said, "His blood be on us and on our children;" and it has been and will be on them till they repent of their atrocious conduct to the being whom the Christians look upon as God, and whom they cannot deny (for even Mahomet acknowledges the fact) to have been at least the holiest and best of men. The Jews then scourged, insulted, and tormented Him, spat on Him, put a crown of thorns on his head, made Him, while fainting with pain, bear the cross till He broke down under its weight, crucified Him, and mocked Him even in his last agonies. Can it be wondered at that there is a gulf which can never be bridged between the Jew and the Christian?

It may be alleged, however, that the generations of Jews who succeeded that which crucified Jesus were less unjust and inhuman; but the lion can no more change his skin or the leopard his spots than the Jews can lose their distinguishing characteristics both of appearance and disposition; and even to this day the hook nose, the shambling gait, and the peculiar accent of the race are unmistakable.

If a colony of negroes had been introduced into England a thousand years ago, and had continuously intermarried, as the Jews have done at the present day, they would not have changed an iota, but would have had the same black skin, woolly hair, and thick lips. Neither has the Jewish type or the gipsies, who are supposed by some to be the lost ten tribes of Israel, altered, which may be seen in one of *Punch's* recent woodcuts of two vendors of

"Old clo'," who congratulate themselves that through the war, though many thousands may be killed and wounded, old clothes will be cheap. Gibbon's imperishable work on the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," moreover, shows us that the Jews during the Middle Ages, so far from amending and becoming humanized, became immeasurably worse; and from this splendid monument of learning and genius I extract the following passages:—

"The Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from obscurity under the successors of Alexander . . . . The sullen obstinacy with which they maintained their peculiar rites and unsocial manners seemed to mark them out a distinct species of men, who boldly professed or who faintly disguised their implacable hatred to the rest of mankind.

"Nota.—Dum Assyrios penes Medosque et Persas Oriens fuit despectissima pars serventium.—*Tacit. Hist.* v. 8.

> Tradidit arcano quæcunque volumine Moses,
> Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti;
> Quæsitos ad fontes solos deducere verpas.

"The letter of this law is not to be found in the present volume of Moses. But the wise, the humane Maimonides openly teaches that if an idolator fall into the water a Jew ought not to save him from instant death.

"The former (the Sadducees), selected from the most opulent and distinguished ranks of society, were strictly attached to the literal sense of the law of Moses, and they proudly rejected the immortality of the soul as an opinion that received no countenance from the divine book. . . The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is omitted in the law of Moses.

"From the reign of Nero to that of Antoninus Pius, the Jews discovered a fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome, which repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections. *Humanity is shocked at the recital of the horrid cruelties which they committed in the cities of Egypt, of Cyrus, and of*

Cyrene, where they dwelt in treacherous friendship with the unsuspecting natives; and we are tempted to applaud the severe retaliation which was exercised by the arms of the legions against these fanatics, whose dire and credulous superstition seemed to render them the implacable enemies, not only of the Roman government, but of human kind. The blind superstition, the abject slavery of those unfortunate exiles (the Jews) must excite the contempt of a philosophic emperor, but they deserved the friendship of Julian by their implacable hatred of the Christian name. The barren synagogue abhorred and envied the fecundity of the rebellious church; the power of the Jews was not equal to their malice, *but their gravest rabbis approved the private murder of an apostate.* .

"Their (the Jews') obstinacy converted his (Mahomet's) friendship into implacable hatred, with which he pursued that unfortunate people to the last moment of his life, and in the double character of an apostle and a conqueror his persecution was extended to both worlds. The Kamoka (a Jewish tribe) dwelt at Medina under the protection of the city. He seized the occasion of an accidental tumult, and summoned them to embrace his religion or contend with him in battle. 'Alas!' replied the trembling Jews, 'we are ignorant of the use of arms, but we persevere in the faith and worship of our fathers; why wilt thou reduce us to the necessity of a just defence?' The unequal conflict was terminated in fifteen days, and it was with extreme reluctance that Mahomet yielded to the importunity of his allies and consented to spare the lives of the captives. But their riches were confiscated, their arms became more effectual in the hands of the Mussulmans, and a wretched colony of 700 exiles were driven with their wives and children to implore a refuge on the confines of Syria . . The Jews had excited and joined the war of the Koreish. *No sooner had the natives retired from the ditch than Mahomet, without laying aside his armour, marched on the same day to extirpate the hostile race of the children of Koraidha* (Jews). After a resistance of twenty days they surrendered at discretion. They trusted to the intercession of their old allies of

Medina; they could not be ignorant that fanaticism obliterates feelings of humanity. A venerable elder to whose judgment they appealed pronounced the sentence of their death; 700 Jews were dragged in chains to the market place of the city, they descended alive into the grave prepared for their execution and burial, and the apostle beheld with an inflexible eye the slaughter of his helpless enemies. Their sheep and camels were inherited by the Mussulmans; 300 cuirasses, 500 pikes, 1,000 lances composed the most useful portion of the spoil. . . . The chief of the tribe at Chaibar (a Jew) was tortured in the presence of Mahomet to force a confession of his hidden treasures.

"If the justice of Tarik protected the Christians, his gratitude and policy rewarded the Jews, to whose secret or open aid he was indebted for his most important acquisitions. Persecuted by the King and synod of Spain, who had often pressed the alternative of banishment or baptism, that outcast nation embraced the moment of revenge; the comparison of their past and present state was the pledge of their fidelity, *and the alliance between the disciples of Moses and of Mahomet was maintained till the final era of their common expulsion.*

[No wonder, then, that when the Spaniards banished the Moors they got rid of the Jews also.]

"In Cyrene they (the Jews) massacred 220,000 Greeks; in Cyprus 240,000; in Egypt a very great mulitude. Many of these unhappy victims were *sawn asunder*, according to precedent, to which David had given the sanction of his example. The victorious Jews devoured the flesh, licked up the blood, and twisted the entrails like a girdle round their bodies (see Dion Cassius, l. 68, p. 1145)."

No wonder, after Gibbon's account of the Jews, that race has always been either despised or hated in all ages and by all nations and all religions, except, perhaps, the modern Greeks, for reasons which it is not difficult to divine.

The massacres of Cyrene and Cyprus, perpetrated by the Jews, included 460,000 victims, besides a very great multitude in Egypt; probably, therefore, they murdered about a million

of human beings, or a greater number than the rest of the human race have ever killed of their unsocial and vindictive race. In comparison with these atrocities those of the Turks even sink into insignificance, for including the massacres during the Greek war of independence at Chios and elsewhere, those of Damascus and Syria, the Bulgarian atrocities, and all the other abominations of the Turks, do not amount either in number or in horror to the conduct of these Shylocks and Fagins, who devoured the flesh and drank the blood of 460,000 Greeks, besides their Egyptian victims, and made girdles of their entrails!

It may be said that I have related events which took place many centuries ago; but that the Jews retain in recent times the same savage ferocity which formerly distinguished them, appears by the following fact, which took place on 21st April, 1821.

"One of the principal causes which hastened the ruin of the Turkish Empire was the murder of Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, a revered prelate 80 years of age, who was seized on Easter Monday as he was descending from the altar where he had been celebrating divine service, and hanged at the gate of his archepiscopal palace, amidst the ferocious cries of a vast crowd of Mussulmans. The blameless life and exemplary character of this prelate, the proof of fidelity to the government which he had recently given by his proclamation against the insurgents, the courage he evinced at his last moments, while they were unable to move his enemies, enshrined his memory in the hearts of his grateful countrymen. . . . After hanging for three hours the body was cut down, *and delivered to a few abandoned Jews, by whom it was dragged through the streets and thrown into the sea.*"

When the Turks defeated the Greeks at Navacta and killed 4,000, the historian tells us: "A band of Jews who had no part in the action, 600 in number, followed in the rear of the victors merely for the pleasure of beating out the brains of the Christians with their clubs. One of them boasted that he had in this manner dispatched 68 victims." Remembering this and other

atrocious circumstances, the Jews need hardly be surprised that the Christians of Turkey have shown some hostility to these persistent allies of the Turk.

With reference to the present generation of Jews (with whom we mix like oil with vinegar), it is a great satisfaction to me to see by the *Almanac de Gotha* that in the United Kingdom we have only about 46,000 Jews, and this may partly account for our prosperity, whilst the special prevalence of the Jewish element may account for the comparative poverty of the Russian Empire.

I see by an Indian paper, in an address soliciting subscriptions to a fund exclusively for the Turkish wounded, that the Mussulmans of India are quite aware of the close ties which unite Jews and Turks, who, it will be observed, are specially bracketed together in our English Prayer-book (like the lion and the lion's provider, the jackal) as the only races whose transcendent wickedness requires special mention in our prayers, for they say, "Followers of Moses, you are bound by the holiest of ties to the sufferers we seek to relieve."

The Russophobe Jews, however, do not appear to observe that if they succeeded in entrapping us into a war with Russia, as the Jews are included in the Russian conscription, thousands of their countrymen would be killed, and the cost of the war would involve increased taxes, which their co-religionists, who they say are now in the lowest depths of poverty, could hardly bear.

A well-known story may be thus adapted to the present state of affairs. A Russophobe Jew meets a Russophile bishop of his acquaintance, and says to him, "Do you know the difference between a bishop and an ass?" "No," says the bishop; upon which Mr. Howard Guelph Plantagenet, *alias* Mr. Judas Iscariot, answers, "The one wears a cross on his breast, the other on his back." "Good," says the bishop; "but do you know the difference between a Turkomaniac Jew and an ass?" "No," says the Jew. "Nor I either," replies the bishop to the discomfited Hebrew.

Everyone who has read the report of the Select Com

mittee on Foreign Loans* knows of what untold millions we are robbed by Jews who bring out rotten loans, and other public companies, then rig the market, and wriggle out themselves, and the cement in the edifice of their fortunes is moistened with the tears of the plundered widow and orphan. We all know the villainous mock auctions and knocks-out which are chiefly carried out by Jews. At the former incautious people are deluded into buying spurious articles by sham competition and outrageous lying, whilst the latter are managed in this way: The widow of a clergyman, officer, or professional man, is compelled from poverty to sell her furniture, which may have cost say £1,000. On the day of sale the room is crowded with dirty Jew brokers, smelling most abominably, and of the rudest manners, who hustle and annoy intending purchasers, especially ladies, and if necessary bid far more than the value of articles for which honest persons offer, so as to choke them off. By these and other means they then buy up the whole for perhaps £100 to £200, and then they have a real auction at the nearest public-house, where the articles fetch perhaps £500 to £600, and the difference is divided amongst these scoundrels, to the prejudice of the poor widow. The genial and unrivalled Dickens, in the whole of his delightful works, has drawn, as far as I am aware, but one portrait of a Jew, namely Fagin in "Oliver Twist," and he is far more repulsive than Shylock; in fact, I do not remember one favourable sketch of a Jew in the whole compass of my reading of English literature. Fagin, it will be observed, trained young Gentiles (not Jews) for the gallows, and taught thieving, robbery, and murder as a regular profession or trade. Whilst he contrived, "put up," or "resetted" crimes of various kinds, and was a receiver of stolen goods, he took the utmost care to keep his own carcase out of all danger, using the criminals he had trained, and others whom he ferreted out, like cats' paws to get the chesnuts, of which he took an exorbitant

* The Jews in England always persuade our gullible statesmen to let them bring out British loans at enormous commissions, whilst in France loans are aised by free competition much cheaper than from financiers.

share, out of the fire. The reader of "Oliver Twist" cannot help feeling a much stronger aversion to Fagin than to Bill Sykes; and it is an inexpressible relief when Fagin is caught, in spite of all his cunning, and meets with the fate he so richly deserves. If there were no Jew receivers of stolen goods, and no Jew resetters or planners of robberies, there would be far less crime. Most of the few eminent men they have produced looked with contempt on Judaism; for instance, Spinoza, who, after endeavouring to bribe him into an apparent and dishonest compliance with Judaism, they excommunicated, and Heine, who, in 1829, in the sketches styled "The Town of Lucca," called them (the Jews) "'the people of original sin,' who came out of Egypt, the land of crocodiles and priestcraft, and *brought with them, besides their skin diseases and their stolen gold and silver vessels, a so-called positive religion and so-called Church.*" In short, I think I have established that the Jews are not, and never have been, worthy of our esteem and regard, and that they are the eternal and implacable enemies of the Christian; consequently, it would be madness to follow their advice to go to war with Russia, but wisdom always to take the opposite course to that which they recommend.

The position of the Jews in the East is shown in the following extracts from a letter in the *Daily News* of October 13th, 1876:—

"But if there is anything in the eyes of a Turk more mean, more contemptible, more degrading, than the appellation of 'Giaour,'* it is that of 'Jahoudi'† (a Jew). And with all respect to English Israelites, who have nothing in common with the Eastern Jews but religion, and who are as dissimilar from a Balata Jahoudi as a Magyar is from a Tartar, it will be admitted by every one who knows anything of the East, that there is no occupation sufficiently dishonourable, and no work so unspeakably demeaning, that a Jew will not

* Which means an infidel or miscreant, so that a Jahoudi is worse than a miscreant.

† Query, Dean Swift's "Yahoo."

undertake in Turkey for the sake of 'filthy lucre.' In fact, you have only to walk through the streets of Constantinople in order to understand what are the callings toward which Jews tend by predilection. And even in that classic city of mire there is nothing that can compare with the Jewish quarter of Balata, which, in spite of the well-known hoarding of its inhabitants, is retained in such a condition as to have been almost depopulated during the last visitation of cholera.

"We have lately heard of the proceedings instituted in English courts of law against certain members of the Jewish body, who can scarcely have acted under their approved leaders in their shameful dealings with inexperienced undergraduates and other young noblemen. Still these ravenous depredations—degrading, unscrupulous, and contemptible as they are—bear no comparison to the systematic manner in which the ignorant Rouman peasantry are enticed into drinking on credit, are encouraged to run themselves into fearful debts, and are actually made slaves, body and soul, to a professional and well-organized class of Jewish usurers, who cover the land as locusts, and who thus exercise on entire provinces a power more supreme than that of the central Government.

"In fact, the British Protectorate, in spite of the repeated application of the Ionians, persistently refused to the Jews in Corfu and the other islands those civil rights which they obtained *ipso facto* by the union of the Ionian islands to Greece. Indeed, the Jews of Corfu were amongst the most enthusiastic supporters of the Union, and as a token of their gratification at being raised to a civil status, which was denied them by the English, they spontaneously decided upon sending a contingent of volunteers to the Greek army."

That the Jews are a most undesirable element in the population appears from the following extract from Mr. Mackenzie Wallace's "Russia":—

"Of all the colonists of this region (The Steppe), the least prosperous are the Jews. . . . These Jewish colonies were founded as an experiment to see whether the Israelite could be

weaned from his traditionary pursuits and transferred to what some economists call the productive section of society. The experiment has failed, and the cause of the failure is not difficult to find. One has merely to look at these men of gaunt visage and shambling gait, with their loopholed slippers and black threadbare coats reaching down to their ankles, to understand that they are not in their proper sphere. Their houses are in a most dilapidated condition, and their villages remind one of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet. A great part of the land is left uncultivated or let to colonists of a different race. *What little revenue they have is derived chiefly from trade of a more or less clandestine nature.*" In short, you might as well attempt to make pigeons out of hawks as industrious farmers out of Jews.

As the first Christians were Jews, and as all Christians receive the Old Testament, from which the Jews think it is evident that Jesus was not the Messiah, they consider our estrangement from the true fold of Judaism as wilful and culpable, and hate us with all the rancour which true believers usually feel towards apostates.

The Jews are divided into two principal sections—the Talmudists, who accept the oral law and all the additional absurdities which have been engrafted by the rabbins on the Old Testament; and the congregation of British Jews, formed in 1840 and 1841 by certain families of Spanish and German Jews for uniting two sections of the community, diminishing the influence of Talmudism, and simplifying the rituals—recognizing the Mosaic Scriptures as the only authority for faith and practice, and rejecting the oral law or Talmudic rabbins as not binding on the consciences of reformed Jews. In short, the bulk of the Israelites are a species of Jewish Catholics, and the Reformers are a species of Old Catholics or Protestants.

The Americans have the same dislike to the Jews as the Roumanians and Servians, as will be seen by the following extract from the *New York Times*:—

"The topic of the day is whether Jews ought to be excluded

from hotels, and to this burning question the *New York Times* has devoted eight solid columns of pretty close type. A wealthy Hebrew family of this city applied for rooms at the Grand Union Hotel in Saratoga (where they had been in the habit of spending their summers for several years), and were informed that by direction of the proprietors all Jews were hereafter to be excluded from the house. Now, it so happens that the Israelite against whom the decree of banishment has just been enforced holds a place among Jews corresponding to that held by the Grand Union among hotels. He is Mr. Joseph Seligman, a member of the well-known banking firm at present concerned in the syndicate which has undertaken the placing of the new national loan. He is Vice-President of the Union League Club, a prominent member of the Chamber of Commerce, a man who stands high in Wall Street and in society, and is somewhat noted for his activity in charitable enterprises. The rule of the house is a general one, and Mr. Hilton declares very frankly that Jews ruin the business; they are obnoxious to the other guests. Of course there is but one opinion expressed of this case in public. It is denounced on all hands as an outrage, for which the Grand Union Hotel deserves to suffer. But I am constrained to confess that in private the expressions of indignation are not so very hearty. Mr. Hilton tells the plain truth when he says that there is a prejudice against Israelites at watering-place hotels, and that several pleasant resorts, once fashionable, have lost caste and lost money since the Israelites began to frequent them. Many admit that they prefer not to receive Hebrew families, and the landlords of Long Branch in particular (which has become known of late years as 'a Jew place') seem to be pretty nearly of one mind that 'Jews are not desirable boarders.' It is notorious that there are some large hotels in New York, of which the St. James's is perhaps the most conspicuous, where Jews cannot obtain accommodation. They are not excluded on account of their race, but the landlords apply the process known as 'roosting them out'—give them rooms next the roof, and charge them extravagant prices. It is a curious circumstance

that the managers of the Grand Union, by their treatment of Mr. Seligman, have made themselves liable to a fine of 1,500 dols. and imprisonment for a year under the provisions of the Civil Rights Bill, passed in 1875 for the protection of the coloured people."

In 1852 there was a violent outbreak against the Jews in Stockholm, and, in fact, when any Christian is in the hands of the Jews, we give them up as hopelessly lost as the Canaanitish nations whom they exterminated.

The Jews were banished from England from A.D. 1290 till 1650, and I never read that we were the worse for their absence, so that Shakespeare's typical Shylock must have been drawn with his usual masterly skill from imagination and reading.

Stow tells us that "every Jew money-lender was compelled to wear a plate on his breast signifying his trade, or to quit the realm;" and as cabmen and omnibus conductors are obliged to wear badges, I see no reason why usurers, whose trade is as noxious as that of the other is beneficial, should not be subjected to the same regulation.

If a man falls into the hands of a Christian money-lender, he contents himself usually with bleeding him, as it were, in a single vein, while the Jew, who is *hostis Gentili generis*, bleeds every vein and artery, and leaves you penniless, like a squeezed orange, or like the stock-meat which a cook makes into a transparent jelly by pressing out the whole of the juice, so that even the dogs will not eat the tasteless fibre which remains. Whilst with the Christian your debt might increase in an arithmetical progression, the Jew would make it increase in the same time in a geometrical progression, so that in an incredibly short time, if you were to become ultimately a millionaire, not a shilling would remain. It is a crying sin and shame that when a youth comes up from a happy home to the university or the army, these Jewish harpies are allowed to go and tempt him by displaying jewelry at two or three hundred per cent. profit to Mr. Verdant Green, who at last—partly to get rid of importunity, as he thinks he must take something, having allowed the Jew to expend so much time in

showing his mosaic treasures, and partly to gratify a sister or a sweetheart—on the verbal, but not written assurance, that he is to have an indefinite time to pay, consents to purchase something, or else he backs a bill to save a friend from ruin and disgrace, and then his own fate is sealed, and Shylock treats him with no more mercy than a spider does a poor fly whom it has caught within its toils.*

I might say something further on Jewish mock auctions and "knocks out" by which widows and orphans are robbed.

It is very strange, if the Jews really believe in their religion, that they do not kill the paschal lamb and perform the various ceremonies of the Mosaic law, nearly all of which they totally neglect; and the leading representative of the Jewish community gave an entertainment to a Royal personage the other day, when the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath was wholly disregarded.

If the wealthy Jews of London are so passionately fond of that howling wilderness which they call the promised land, and which is so cleverly described in "Eöthen," why do they not go and build houses and live there, at least for part of the year? and why do not they spend the evening of their days in Jerusalem? Not one of them, however, does so, and few Jews ever visit Palestine; whilst those who do seldom, if ever, return there.

The rich Jews throughout the world could easily afford to buy up Palestine from the Turks and to rebuild the city and the temple in greater splendour than ever; but they prefer whining by deputy at the Jews' wailing place at Jerusalem, groaning in England over their imaginary grievances and waiting on Providence, instead of helping themselves.

The Jews, however, are perhaps as useful in relieving us of our money as leeches are in depleting us of our blood.†

Even in England the Jews were not allowed to sit in Parliament till 1860, and the *World* says that the Queen refused to make

* It is about as easy to extract sunbeams from cucumbers as mercy to Gentile from a Jew.

† Bianconi says the Jews lend money at 200 and 300 per cent. interest.

Baron Rothschild a peer; whilst a Jewish M.P. told me that he and his family received notice to quit their lodgings at a watering-place because they were Jews.

Tacitus says of the Jewish character:—"Between themselves an invincible fidelity, a charity always active; against the rest of the world, an indomitable hatred."

In order to excite prejudice in the minds of the British public against the down-trodden Christians of Turkey, the Government, with their usual Philo-Turkish unfairness, have, *apropos de bottes*, issued a Blue Book containing indeed 30 pages with reference to the recent alleged and much exaggerated ill-treatment of the Jews in Roumania, but also 329 pages relating to accusations against the Servians and Roumanians, going back to 1867, the object being to attempt to show that the Christians of Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina are not fitted for freedom, since they would, it is asserted but not proved, ill-treat that part of the population which consists of people of other races and religions, and more especially the Jews.

I have to remark that, contrary to the usual practice, the despatches and other statements of the Roumanian Ministers are not translated, and as French is about as unintelligible as Chinese to the great majority of the English population and of the members of both Houses of Parliament, this places their Jewish accusers at an enormous and unfair advantage, to redress which I will now translate some of these despatches.

I shall commence by quoting three important, lucid, and able despatches from Vice-Consul St. John, which completely take the wind out of the sails of the Judomaniacs.

Vice-Consul St. John to Earl Granville.—(*Received May*, 14).

(Extract.) *Jassy, April* 29, 1872.

HAVING now resided several months at Jassy, where the Jews of this country may be said to have established their head-quarters, I have the honour to report to your lordship that I have made myself acquainted with the condition of the Jews in Moldavia, but more especially of those inhabiting this town.

The population of Jassy, which now amounts to nearly 90,000 souls, contains about 50,000 Jews, out of which number 40,000 are Austrian subjects, the remainder being made up by Roumanians and Russians.

In the year 1830 the Jews in this Principality amounted to 10,000 only, whereas at the present time there are, at the very least, 200,000, so that during the last forty years their number has increased more than twentyfold.

Owing to the natural disposition which the Jews possess for trade and commerce, they have now not only acquired great wealth, but, by their industry, perseverance, and frugal habits, have succeeded in monopolizing every trade or calling by which money can be turned.

The great prosperity which many of the Jews have enjoyed in this country of late years has caused considerable immigration from Galicia and Russia, as, in order to evade conscription, thousands were induced to abandon their own country and to settle in Roumania, where greater facilities exist for pursuing profitably their various vocations.

This influx of Jews, proving to a certain extent detrimental to the welfare of the Christian population, has now engaged the attention of the Government, and has resulted in a law having lately been passed by which all foreigners and Jews are to be prohibited from selling spirits.

The new law, which is to be enforced next year, will have the effect of throwing hundreds of Jewish families out of employment.

Various opinions are entertained as to the advantages of this sudden change.

Some assert that the sale of spirits was more profitably carried on while in the hands of the Jews; others allege that the hitherto existing privileges led to great abuses, and tended to demoralize the working classes.

Many of the Jews at Jassy have now intimated their intention of leaving the country, but it is generally believed that none will be compelled to carry out this resolution.

Being fertile in resources, it is supposed that they will have sufficient time between this and next year to adopt other means for earning a livelihood.

The coming law has caused a good deal of dissatisfaction among the land-owners, as many of them have concluded profitable contracts with the Jews for the sale of spirits.

Although the prohibition includes all aliens as well as Jews, and is obviously directed towards the latter, I have to report to your lordship that during my experience in this town not a single case of persecution has come to my knowledge, and that my Austrian colleague, having 40,000 fellow-subjects of the Jewish persuasion in Jassy alone, whose interests it is his duty to look after, has repeatedly stated to me that no complaint of that nature has ever been brought before him.

Many persons who have spoken to me on the subject, and who are amicably disposed towards the Jews, have expressed their regrets that the Jewish Alliance should not have turned their attention to civilizing their co-religionists, rather than to so readily giving credence to a number of false or exaggerated reports that were so widely spread at the beginning of last year, and which I have since ascertained to have originated in this town, and to have been circulated throughout Europe and the United States by means of pamphlets written in the Hebrew language.

The marked antipathy existing in this town towards the Jews arises not so much on account of the difference of religion as from their persistency in not conforming to civilized habits and dress, and more particularly from their palpable want of cleanliness—a fact which any one may easily ascertain by passing a few hours at Jassy.

Vice-Consul St. John to Lord Granville.

July 31, 1872.

Having now passed several months in the Principalities, I

have had ample opportunities for hearing the Jewish question discussed by the most competent persons, and the more the facts of the case are brought to light, the more convinced am I that persecution in the sense conveyed by Sir Francis Goldsmid's speech in the House of Commons does not exist and never has existed in these Principalities, at all events not under the last three Governments.

It may appear bold in me to make such assertion, in the face of everything that has been said on that subject in the House of Commons, but I beg to assure your lordship that the same views are entertained by all my colleagues, and that they are reporting to their respective Governments in the same sense.

The question has often been put to me, "Why, if the Jews find themselves systematically persecuted, do they continue to avail themselves of every possible stratagem to elude the vigilance of the functionaries at the frontiers in order to settle in these Principalities by thousands?"

The number of Jews said to have taken up their abode in the Moldo-Wallachian Principalities is about 300,000, out of which 40,000 only are descendants of Jews who have inhabited the country for generations back; the remainder is composed of immigrants and their children from Galicia and Russia.

The antipathy which is often found to exist against the Jews in other countries is, perhaps, aggravated in this, on account, probably, of the overwhelming numbers to be found in certain towns, such as Jassy, where out of 70,000 inhabitants 40,000 are Jews; as also by reason of their enterprise, industry, perseverance, and parsimony, in contrast with the apathy and extravagance of the owner of the soil.

Mr. St. John to the Earl of Derby.—(*Received March* 31).

Belgrade, March 20, 1877.

My Lord,—I have the honour to report that M. Ristitch, the Servian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in reply to my question with

regard to the future condition of the Jews in this country, formed me that Servian subjects of that persuasion were on the same footing, and enjoyed the same privileges, both civil and political, as the Servians; with the restriction, however, of not being permitted to establish themselves permanently in the rural districts, or in any town except Belgrade.

On my putting the same question to Prince Milan, and receiving a similar reply, I asked him what the objection was to the native-born Jews enjoying the same liberties as their Christian fellow-subjects. His Highness said that a strong feeling existed against them among merchants and shopkeepers, who were under the impression that were every privilege accorded the Jews, an encouragement would be given to those of Poland and Roumania to settle in this country, whereby the native Christian trader would be driven out of the field, and the peasantry, by the establishment of public-houses and usury, utterly demoralised.

From Vice-Consul St. John's dispatches, it thus appears that nearly half the filthy Jewish population of Jassy are vagabond foreigners, whose increase the Principalities have as much right to restrain as the Californians and Australians to stem the flood of Chinese immigration.

It is certainly singular that persecution seems to add so enormously to the numbers of the Jewish inundation, for whilst in 1830 the Principality of Moldavia was only subjected to the infliction of 10,000 Jews, she was burdened with 200,000 in 1873, which, though Jews breed like rabbits, must have been chiefly caused by immigration of foreign Jews to enjoy the sweets of alleged intolerance.

As the Jews "have succeeded in monopolising every trade or calling by which money can be turned," of course the Christians should be duly grateful, and quite willing to be their hewers of wood and drawers of water. The immigration, it will be observed, is stated by Mr. St. John to be from Galicia as well as

Russia, so that the Poles and Austrians do not seem to treat the Jews in a more brotherly way than the Russians.

The Jews complain bitterly that they are no longer allowed to demoralize the country by selling spirits, for, of course, the Gentile only exists to afford food to his parasite the Jew, and I wonder our Jeroboams, Nadabs, Baashas, Ahabs, Jehorams, Jehoahazs, Ahazs, Zedekiahs, &c., do not complain that the English Government some years ago, in contravention of the principle of free trade, put down the profitable gambling houses, or "hells," which they established in Albemarle Street, Leicester Square, &c., where the unwary got any quantity of drugged champagne gratis.

Mr. St. John, it will be observed, says that during his experience in Jassy, "*not a single case* of persecution has come to my knowledge," which is confirmed by his Austrian colleague, and he adds, "the marked antipathy existing in this town (Jassy) towards the Jews arises not so much on account of their religion as for their persistency in not conforming to civilized habits and dress, and more particularly from their palpable want of cleanliness;" and an Englishman, seeing how they pig it, on visiting their place of worship, called it the Jewish "swine-agogue."

In short, the Moldavians must either fraternise with these human badgers and risk pestilence, or be accused of intolerance.

I come now to the despatch from M. Cogalniceano, Minister of the Interior of Roumania (Inclosure in No. 284 of Blue Book), of which the following is an extract:—

"In Roumania the Jews do not only constitute a distinct religious community, but also, in all the force of the term, a nationality foreign to the Roumanians, by its origin, language, manners, and even its sentiments.

"In Roumania the Jews are not what they are in other civilised countries, that is to say, French in France, English in England, Italians in Italy, Germans in Germany, differing from the natives only in religion, and for the rest entirely assimilated to the other classes of the population, and that long before they had obtained

the right which they claim in Roumania before becoming Roumanians in fact.

"The Government and the nation have then the right and the duty to interest themselves in the progress of this foreign population which lives in the midst of us, and which grows incessantly by the emigration of the Jews of Galicia and of Podolia, neighbouring provinces of ancient Poland.

"There is no question of religious persecution, for if it was so the Israelites would meet with obstacles or restrictions in the exercise of their religion, which is not the case. Their synagogues would not be freely built at the side of Christian churches; their religious teaching, the publication of their holy books, would be equally forbidden.

"If the Rabbinate, if religious instruction, if the establishments of education, and of beneficence, are much less advanced among the Jews than among the Christian, that is in consequence of the little initiative and the backward state of culture of the great majority of the Israelites, especially those beyond Milcov. For the little progress that the Israelites of Moldavia have made in these last few years in these branches of religious and moral improvement, they are indebted to the Roumanian Government, and permit me to say, to me also, to me especially, who during the three occasions on which I have had the honour to be put at the head of the Ministry of the Interior, at the risk even of compromising myself before my countrymen, and *I must say against the will and the prejudices of the majority of the Israelites, I have worked with perseverance to enlighten their young men,* and to assimilate them to the other inhabitants of Roumania. I will not enlarge further on my labours. I prefer leaving the accompanying documents, which have been addressed to me by the most influential Israelites of Jassy and Bucharest—their names must be known to the Israelite Alliance of Paris.

"By reading these documents the Marquis of La Valette will be convinced, I think, that even the most enlightened Israelites complain of the ignorance and the prejudices of the great majority of their co-religionists, and that that is the most serious

obstacle which still retards the progress of instruction among the Israelites, and consequently their assimilation to the Roumans.

"His Excellency will see again that whilst the other population and communities of the country claim an extension of rights in the management of their affairs, the most influential Israelites demand the abolition of the autonomy which has been granted to them, as a fatal gift, because it makes them the prey of the ignorance and the prejudices of the multitude.

"In short all these same documents will show to the French Minister all which in the successive periods of my administration I have done to enlighten and instruct the Israelites, and will prove to him consequently that one cannot stigmatise with the name of barbarians and of persecutors on religious matters the administration of which I have the honour to form a part, and myself in particular.

"I have treated the question in a national point of view, and in passing in a religious point of view; I will now discuss the question on its economic side.

"All those who have visited the Principalities, and especially Moldavia, have been alarmed at the sad aspect, not to use a stronger term, which the Polish Jews present by whom our towns are encumbered. Their alarm has only redoubled when by an examination of the commerce, industry, and means of existence of this multitude, these travellers have convinced themselves that the Jews consume without producing; and that their great, or rather their only, industry is the trade in drink. The representatives of the Powers who live in Jassy have acknowledged themselves, I am convinced, this terrible scourge which devours the life of Moldavia. And if it was permitted to me to call as a witness one of the agents of the European Powers, who, in their character as Christian Powers, owe also a share of their compassion to the Christians of Moldavia, I should only have to address myself to the Consul of France itself at Jassy.

"This is why, not to-day, but for long years, at all times, and under all governments, all princes, all the statesmen of Roumania,

all those who take a serious interest in their country, have occupied themselves with the imperious necessity to prevent the victimisation of the Rouman people by a foreign people—by the Jews. . . . I am animated by no sentiment of hatred against the Jews. As far as the laws of the country permit, I exert myself to enable them to partake the advantages of industrial liberty, and as a proof here are my ordinances (letter D) which even in villages grant a temporary domicile to different categories of Israelitish workmen, such as machinists, distillers, masons, cabinet makers, tailors, shoemakers. To go further, contrary to the express laws and the interest of my country, would be to compromise public security; for the Rouman population, not finding in the Government the protection and the defence which it has a right to expect, might have recourse to extreme measures of which the Jewish publicans would be the first victims. . . . The Israelites enjoy the most absolute liberty of conscience and religion; they have obtained many civil rights; they can exercise several professions which were formerly interdicted to them; they can be professors and doctors, and as such become State functionaries; they can also be druggists and lithographers, which was formerly forbidden to them. By the communal law, several categories of Jews, and in particular those who have passed through the schools or the army, have acquired communal rights. In short, the Israelites enjoy to-day several constitutional rights. Respect for their domiciles and their person, the right of instruction paid by the State, liberty of conscience and of meeting, as well as that of the press, they possess on the same footing as the Roumans."

In proof of M. Cogalniceano's statements as to his kindness to the Jews, I quote, first, part of a letter of the President of the Israelite community at Bucharest to M. Cogalniceano, dated 5th May, 1869:—

"The native Israelitish community created, by the establishment of a 'gabelle,' or tax on the sale of meat, funds which have served for the foundation of primary schools, where 450 boys and 180 girls study the Hebrew, Roumanian, and German

languages. Besides religious teaching, the community has also founded institutions of beneficence, such as the hospital, which possesses twenty-eight beds. It has besides distributed to the poor assistance in money and in kind at regular intervals, or in difficult circumstances. Things have gone on in this way with more or less facility until the end of last year, 1868.

"Now, however, after having been constrained to suppress some of the benevolent institutions, and to cease the distribution of alms, after having renounced the construction of a school already projected, the community sees itself reduced on the one hand to suppress definitively the 'gabelle,' which produces hardly anything, and, on the other hand, to shut the hospital and even the schools in consequence of an absolute want of funds. *Some retrograde Israelites, who establish their own gabelle, are the cause of this deplorable situation;* but as they are only a small number, and their institutes are very restricted, they put little or nothing in the shape of taxes on the sale of meat, and cause consequently a disastrous opposition to the native community, which organizes and keeps up considerable establishments in the shape of those of which we have spoken above.

"*In presence of this lamentable state of affairs, the undersigned, in his character as President of the community, entreats you, as Minister, to be so good as to abolish definitively the autonomy of the commune, and to place it again under the orders of the Ministry of the Interior.*

(Signed),

ADOLPHE VAIMBERG."

I now add the address of the Israelite notables of Jassy to M. Cogalniceano, Minister of the Interior, dated 29th April, 1869:—

"Excellency,—Your presence at Jassy awakens in us agreeable recollections—those of the flourishing state of the Israelite religious community at the epoch of your administration in 1860 and 1864. Then our community developed itself rapidly, thanks to the sincere and energetic support of your excellency, and the Israelitish youth began to warm itself at the sun of progress and civilization.

"Already more than 1,000 young Israelites enjoyed the advantages of a moral education; and the study of the language and the history of Roumania was followed with zeal and assiduity, beside the careful study of the Hebrew religion in five primary Rouman and Israelitish schools, which were founded under the auspices and by the benevolent protection of your excellency.

"The Israelitish children began to assimilate by language and manners to their Rouman brothers of the Christian rite, and marched rapidly in the path of progress. Already the Israelite hospital was enlarged; from day to day the number of beds was raised to 130; the sick Israelites and all Roumania found there an asylum; and the sanitary state of all the country was equally progressive. The servants of our religion had their future assured, pensions were granted to their widows," &c.

I think it is now clearly proved that M. Cogalniceano was fully justified in all that he states in his dispatch as to his equitable and benevolent conduct towards the Jews of Roumania.

As another illustration of the barbarous condition of the Jews, I cite the following sentence from a letter of M. Bratiano, one of the Ministers of Roumania, to the Mayor of Jassy, dated May 24th, 1867:—

"I yesterday visited the Jewish hospital. It is in a most deplorable state—want of space and cleanliness, and the crowding of the patients to the extent of putting two in a bed; infection, and, in short, a state of things endangering the public health of the town of Jassy. I therefore require you, Mr. Mayor, to take urgent measures to remedy these evils, and to see that the sick are placed in spacious and well-ventilated rooms, sufficient for their number, and also that the necessary care be taken to avoid the spreading of epidemic diseases."

Perhaps, however, to enforce sanitary regulations on the Jews is considered by them to be persecution, just as a bath is considered a severe punishment by a casual pauper in a workhouse. That the Jews are really subjected to much worse persecutions

by their dear masters, the Mahometans, than those from which they pretend they suffer at the hands of the Christians, appears from (Inclosure in No. 90) the following portion of a letter from M. Manuel to Sir F. Goldsmid, dated Universal Israelite Alliance, Paris, August 19th, 1867:—

"SIR,—The acts of violence committed against the Israelites of Zliten, in the Regency of Tripoli, as to which your attention has doubtless been directed, have given occasion for an inquiry, commenced in pursuance of instructions which the Consuls-General of France and England have received from their Governments. This inquiry, the results of which are perhaps known to you, terminates with the conclusion, which the consuls have agreed to, to demand from the local government the following redress:—

"1. The punishment of the Cadi of Zliten and his assessors, who have excited the fanaticism of the Mussulmans against the Israelites.

"2. Punishment of the guilty as soon as they shall have been discovered.

"3. Reconstruction of the Israelite Synagogue, at the expense of the district of Zliten.

"4. Indemnity for the Bibles destroyed.

"5. Protection of the Israelite cemetery against the interference of the Mussulmans.

"6. Setting apart a special guard for the defence of the Israelites.

"The Turkish Government has done us the honour to communicate to us the dispatch by which it demands itself the punishment of the guilty and the restoration of the damage caused to the Israelites, in order to prevent by these measures the repetition of such acts of fanaticism. But the Pasha of Tripoli does not seem so well disposed to our co-religionists, and these cannot regain safety if the offences of which they have been victims remain unpunished.

"We hear from Tetuan, in Morocco, that a pasha has arrived with 500 men to protect the town from the brigands. But this

pasha seems very ill-disposed towards the Israelites. He forbade them passing through a gate of the town which leads to a cemetery visited daily by men and women. This gate has been open to the Israelites since the occupation of the country by the Spaniards. Besides, Israelitish men and women who have been struck in the by-ways of the town by Moors have in vain complained to the pasha to obtain redress for these acts of violence. It would appear as if this pasha wishes to accomplish the revival of a fanaticism which has been dormant for years, thanks to the protection given to the Israelites by the representatives of the European Governments." The Jewish and other Turcomaniac enemies of the cause of the Christians of Turkey do not even allege such severe persecution as M. Manuel describes, on the part of either the Roumanians or Servians.

M. Matitsch, another of the Servian Ministers, says of the Jews, "The Israelites of Servia, persisting in their ancient tradition, continue unfortunately to cause the rest of the population to feel strongly that, far from wishing to assimilate themselves to it, they only seek to isolate themselves, morally and materially.

"It is thus that, in the days of trial of a nation, they have hastened to abandon their country, only to return when the danger had disappeared. Latterly, again, on the occasion of the bombardment of Belgrade, they have given proof of the same disposition, notwithstanding that the origin of this deplorable conflict must be attributed to the care which the Servian authorities took to cause the inviolability of the domicile of an Israelite, his lodger, to be respected by his Mussulman landlord.

"The Israelites hasten to leave the country as soon as they have amassed some fortune. There are some even who, having quitted Belgrade before the bombardment of 1862, and fixed their domicile in a neighbouring foreign town, persist still in residing abroad, whilst passing every day at Belgrade to look after their commercial and other affairs.

"Their excessive aversion to military service, to which all Servian citizens are bound, wounds the sentiment of their country-

men. It is disagreeable to them to send their children to the State schools to such an extent that these establishments are only frequented by some few scholars of their persuasion, and one often meets amongst them individuals who, though born in the country, do not know its language. Their distrust towards their fellow-citizens is such that, on the occasion of the last epidemic of cholera at Belgrade, they would not send their native sick to the great hospital; and the Government was obliged to establish for them a special hospital, served by two doctors of their religion, and paid by the State. These essentially exclusive tendencies of the Israelite population in Servia—this isolation in which it is their pleasure to shut themselves up—is not of a nature to favour the weakening of the restrictions of which it is the object, nor to facilitate to the Government the realisation of the liberal intentions by which it is animated towards it."

I will now quote the following extract from the *Moniteur Roumain* of September 2nd, 1869:—

"The Minister of the Interior has addressed the following note, dated 16th August, to the Prefect of Belgrade.

"Prefect,—Our country during the last few years is filled with vagabonds. Finding no place in our towns, they have begun to spread themselves in our villages; and in several localities, principally beyond Milcov, they have become a veritable scourge for our population. The evil increases from day to day. It is the duty of the Administration to have recourse to the most energetic measures to put an end to it as quickly as possible.

"No country in the world can force Roumania to become or to continue the asylum of vagabonds flying or driven from neighbouring countries. Every commune, as well as the State itself, has the right and the duty to repel from its bosom men who are not born on its territory, people without occupation, in a word, those who do not offer society the necessary guarantees of honest labour and usefulness to the other inhabitants.

"Here, however, a difficulty presents itself. The commune and the State may repel such vagabonds, but the country from

which they come refuses in many cases to let them repass the frontier. That being so, we must seek for a means of avoiding this evil. We must continue in some way to constrain to a useful labour those whom we cannot drive from our country unless they can themselves find means to quit it. One of these means would be, in my opinion, the establishment of agricultural colonies. . . ."

The Prince of Roumania stated to Consul Green that he had received a telegram from M. Ion Bratiano, stating that the reported persecution of the Jews was quite false; that hygienic measures had been taken to prevent a new outbreak of cholera; and that police regulations had been applied to the foreign vagabonds investing the country; but that these measures had been carried out with even more care than had been the case at Bucharest. With respect to the necessity for steps being taken in the interest of the public health in the Jewish quarters of Jassy, his Highness observed that he could himself bear witness, as he had seen single rooms in which ten families were living in a state of filth of which it was impossible to form an idea from any description.

M. Golesco, after complaining to Consul Green of the vagrancy of the Jews, attributing the evil to their having Austrian passports—although, as he observed to him, passports were not required in Roumania—said that the greatest evil the Jews had to complain of was the tyranny of their own elders, who subject them to heavy taxation; and that the Government was about taking measures, as it was its duty to do, to put a stop to these abuses. Mr. Green could not help thinking, while M. Golesco was speaking in this sense, of the well-grounded fears of M. Halfon, and no doubt of all the upper classes of Jews, that the Government would invent some means of insuring their docility. It would not be difficult to obtain by intimidation the signatures of any amount of poor Jews accusing their richer brethren of oppression and fraud.

M. Boeres stated to the same Consul, "Son Excellence M. le Ministre est aussi très-mal informé quand il croit que les

Juifs n'ont pas chez nous le droit de fabriquer des spiritueux, de tenir des cabarets ou de vendre des liqueurs.

"Ils exercent tous ces droits. Le fait est facile à constater. Leurs fabriqueurs de spiritueux sont nombreuses dans le pays, et même aux environs de la capitale. Il en est de même des cabarets, qu'ils ont dans toutes les villes.

"Ce qui leur a été défendu, par une recente loi sur les spiritueux, c'est le droit de tenir cabaret et de vendre des liqueurs dans les communes rurales, et sur les grandes routes.

"Mais cette disposition, que n'est du reste que le renouvellement d'une ancienne coutume, est une simple mesure d'hygiène et de police rurale. Ce n'est pas chez nous, les premiers, qu'elle a été prescrite; nous avons imité en cela, comme en bien d'autres choses, des nations bien plus civilisées, et plus expérimentées que nous. Une pareille disposition, et dans des termes encore plus restrictifs, a existé en Prusse, dans le Wurtemburg, dans le Grand-Duché de Bade jusqu'en l'année 1869. Des dispositions restrictives dans les même sens existent encore aujourd'hui en Russie."

I conclude my quotations with the following dispatch from Vice-Consul St. John:—

Bucharest, August 21, 1872.

My Lord,—In a conversation which I had some months ago with Mr. Peixotto, the American Consul-General, on the subject of the Jews in this country, and the evils occasioned by their overwhelming numbers, I suggested to him that, as he had their welfare so much at heart, he should propose some scheme for their emigration to the United States. It occurred to me that, if the Jews of this country possessed all those habits of industry, thriftiness, and order, which he never ceases to attribute to them, they would doubtless prove a useful community in America, and would at the same time be rescued from that persecution at the hands of the Christians which he so persistently makes it his business to proclaim to the world.

Mr. Peixotto, at the time, expressed no opinion, but from what has now taken place it is evident that he has considered and adopted the idea, as, in a recent report by the Roumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Council of Ministers, a letter is stated to have been received from the American Consul-General inquiring what assistance would be offered here were such a scheme set on foot.

In their report to Prince Charles the Council of Ministers recommended to his Highness that the proposal should be brought before the Assembly on its meeting, and that free passports should be supplied to poor Jews who may desire to emigrate.

It is, however, doubted by those most competent to judge whether many Jews would avail themselves of the opportunity to emigrate even should the joint action of the Government here and of benevolent societies in America and elsewhere enable them to do so.

Should the facility for emigration offered by such a scheme be insufficient to induce the Jewish population to avail themselves of the opportunity, it would go far to refute the accusations brought by Mr. Peixotto against the authorities in this country.

I have, &c.

(Signed) C. L. St. John.

I have now sufficiently proved that though there may have been rare and insignificant acts of persecution performed by the Roumanians and Servians on the Jews, these have been usually occasioned by their own misconduct, the filthiness of their persons and dwellings, their unsatiable avarice and usury, and the demoralization caused by their selling intoxicating liquors contrary to law; and it appears that, so to speak, a box on the ears received by a Jew from a Servian or Roumanian Christian is less endurable than being knocked down and stunned by his dear friends the Mussulmans at Tripoli and Morocco.

In one respect, however, they have scrupulously observed a line of conduct which is warmly approved by Christ, for every stranger who has had recourse to them invariably exclaims, "I was a stranger, and ye took me in."

OPINIONS ON TURKEY BY TRAVELLERS OF VARIOUS NATIONALITIES.

M. DE LAMARTINE says :—

"The Turks, by the inherent and irreclaimable viciousness of their administration and of their habits, are incapable of governing their present territory in Europe and Asia, or either of them. They have depopulated the countries which owned their sway, and have destroyed themselves by the slow suicide of their government."—*Travels in the East*, p. 752.

"The Ottoman empire is no empire at all; it is a misshapen agglomeration of different races without cohesion between them, with mingled interests, without a language, without laws, without religion, without unity or stability of power. You see the breath of life which animated it—namely, religious fanaticism—is extinct. You see that its fatal and blinded administration has devoured the race of conquerors; *and that Turkey is perishing for want of Turks.*"

Mr. J. L. Stephens, the American traveller, who was in that region in 1835, describes the city of Constantinople in these words :—

"We float around the walls of the seraglio, enter the Golden Horn, and before us, with its thousand mosques, and its myriad of minarets, their golden points glittering in the sun, is the Roman city of Constantinople, the Thracian Byzantium, the Stamboul of the Turks; the city which more than all others excites the imagination and interests the feelings; once dividing with Rome the empire of the world; built by a Christian Emperor, and consecrated as a Christian city; 'a burning and a shining light' in a season of universal darkness, all at once lost to the civilized world, falling into the hands of a strange and fanatical people, the gloomy followers of a successful soldier; a city which for nearly four centuries has sat with its gates closed in sullen distrust and haughty defiance of strangers, which once sent forth large and terrible armies, burning, slaying, and destroying, shaking the hearts of princes and people—

now lying, like a sullen giant, huge, unwieldy, and helpless, ready to fall into the hands of the first invader, and dragging out a precarious and ignoble existence, but by the mercy or policy of the great Christian powers."—Incidents of Travels in Turkey, p. 54.

We will take next the opinion of Mr. Eliot Warburton, as able and accomplished a man as ever visited the East :—

"Sultan Mahmoud was one of the five great men who have been the instruments of signalising our age. He ventured on the glorious attempt which few have survived, and none have ever lived to see accomplished—that of regenerating a corrupt people. *The attempt failed utterly, as regarded the creation of new powers and capacities: the old were destroyed, but there was no reproductive principle in the Turkish character.* . . . They are a gallant people, yet, those Osmanlis; and, though they feel that their empire is drawing to a close, and are prepared for the fulfilment of one of those strange old prophecies, like that which prepared the Yncas for the subjugation of *their* country, they will doubtless die fearlessly in defence of those walls so fearlessly won by their fierce ancestors."—*Crescent and the Cross*, p. 390.

Mr. Walsh says :—

"There is more of human life wasted and less supplied (in Turkey) than in any other country. . . . . *We see every day life going out in the fairest portion of Europe, and the human race threatened with extinction in a soil and climate capable of supporting the most abundant population.*"—*Kings of the East*, pp. 2—11.

Under this head, we give the opinion of Mr. Thackeray :—

"The Government of the Ottoman Porte seems to be as rotten, as wrinkled, and as feeble as the old eunuch I saw crawling about it in the sun."—*Notes of a Journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo.*

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in a speech delivered at a banquet given to him at Constantinople in 1852, deplores "*the corruption which eats into the very foundations of society, and a combination of force, fraud, and intrigue which obstruct the march of progress, and poison the very atmosphere in which they prevail.*"

M. Guizot says :—

"Christian Europe has reason to desire that no private ambition may hasten the downfall of those dilapidated Mussulman states that are languishing and falling into ruin at her gates. . . . Providence, however, has issued visible decrees, and we have a right to be pre-conscious of these, and to hold ourselves

in readiness to acknowledge them. The Turks will go out of Europe. The Christian faith and Christian civilisation will not give up their expansive energy. . . . . It is an act of prudence as well as of moral sense for all Christian states to pay great regard to this in their policy, and not to place themselves in direct and permanent conflict with facts which will infallibly one day come to pass, and which, when they do come to pass, will be a triumph for humanity." —*Guizot's "Life of Peel,"* p. 152.

M. de Tocqueville, writing to Mr. Senior, says :—

"What say you of our friends the Turks? Was it worth while to spend so much money and to shed so much blood in order to retain in Europe savages who are ill-disguised as civilised men?"—*Life*, vol. ii., p. 414.

Mr. Spencer says :—

"A welcome sight to the traveller, in these provinces, *who may travel from sea to sea, from the Danube to Constantinople, without beholding the slightest mark of improvement either in the aspect of the country or the industry of the inhabitants.* About ten years ago, I traversed nearly the same route from Constantinople to the Danube. The country was without roads, as it is now, and several of the bridges that then existed have been carried away by the flood, or fallen from decay, without either the inhabitants or the Government attempting to replace them. . . . It is not alone the absence of any change for the better that so forcibly arrests the attention of the traveller, as the deep settled gloom that characterises country, town, village, people, wherever the Osmanli rules."—Vol. ii., pp. 361—2.

Mr. Crowe says :—

"This Asia Minor is, indeed, the greatest disgrace of the Turk, the chief accusation that raises itself against the Ottoman. It is a land capable of the greatest fertility and production, traversed by numbers of rivers—a blessing so rare in so southern a clime. It abounds in ports and minerals. It commands two seas, lies between north, and south, and west, and offers itself as the great channel of communication between the different parts of the globe. There is no country in the world with so many of the elements and capabilities of prosperity. Yet for centuries it has been a desert, a land of oppressors and poverty, spoliation and torture, the very charnel-house of the human kind, counting ten millions of Turks, who can neither thrive nor live industrious themselves, nor allow others to do so. Talk of Turkey in Europe, and of the state of the Christian *rayahs* under the Turks—they are ten times more happy, and the country some hundred times more prosperous and rich, with the small element of a Christian population, even oppressed by the Turks, than can be found in the land which the Turks may be said to have all to themselves. . . . ."—*The Greek and the Turk*, pp. 175, 176.

No less explicit is the language of Mr. Bayle St. John, also a traveller in Turkey, in his work entitled, "The Turks in Europe."

"We have but to cast a glance over the vast provinces which stretch from the banks of the Danube to the limits of constitutional Greece, to see the natural results of the system I have described, carried on by a people so brutal and barbarous as the Turks. These provinces do not contain one quarter of the population they are capable of supporting, and, unlike other countries, the plains are almost desert, whilst the mountains and a few large cities contain the chief part of the inhabitants. Wherever there is a centre of Turkish authority established, a wilderness is at once created around. The greater proportion of the Bulgarian population is dispersed in villages far from the high roads, and a wholesome terror, as I have hinted in a previous chapter, is from time to time struck into them by invasions of armed tax-gatherers. Nothing can be more melancholy than a journey southward from the Danube towards Constantinople. The Bulgarians are naturally a mild and good people, but, as is well known, they have more than once been goaded by excessive oppression into rebellion. . . . If we traverse the Balkan range, and enter upon the vast plains of Thrace, the deserts become naturally more dismal than ever. We are approaching the capital. Adrianople is surrounded by vast expanses covered with cemeteries, and the whole country between the city and Constantinople seems as if it had been just visited by a pestilence. It consists of a vast undulating plain, entirely denuded of trees, and cut up by numerous streams of water, which were once bordered by flourishing towns and fields. Now and then a miserable hamlet occurs; but there are places in which during twelve hours of hard marching there is not a house visible, not a tree, not a shrub."—P. 154.

We will next produce a French witness, M. Blanqui, who was sent by Louis Philippe on a mission to Bulgaria and Constantinople in 1841, and who published his observations in 1845, in a work entitled "Voyage en Bulgarie":—

"From Adrianople to Constantinople is a distance of about fifty leagues. The vast space between the two cities is entirely destitute of trees, and presents the aspect of a long, wide, undulating plain, traversed by more than thirty watercourses. . . . .

"There is something more tristful in the unparalleled journey between these two capital cities. This is the countless number of cemeteries one finds in places where every sign of human habitation has disappeared. What signify these cemeteries? When were they formed? Why do they exist in their entirety, while one cannot find the slightest trace of the towns and villages which stocked them with so many dead? . . .

"But there are things even more sad than these cemeteries without villages

—I mean villages without inhabitants. I saw a good many such between Adrianople and Constantinople: the houses were open to wind and rain, the roofs had fallen in, the domestic hearth was empty. Lizards, rats, screech-owls, bats, had taken the place of human beings, destroyed by plague or by poverty, or dispersed by emigration; and these villages were surrounded by fertile lands, and everywhere flowed rivulets and brooks, and the sky overhead was pure and serene; and if, now and then, a tree existed near a fountain, it was so grand and so beautiful, that fifty men on horseback might shelter themselves in its shades. *What then, has transformed these fertile countries of Thrace into desolated steppes? What but Mussulman barbarity? The mosque alone stands erect in the midst of the ruin which it has caused. The only living creatures we saw were birds of prey. . . .*

"The desert extends to the very ramparts of Constantinople. As we approached the capital we expected to find some sign of road-making; there was none. The Turks have everything *to begin.*"

The Earl of Carlisle visited Turkey just before the Crimean war, and his verdict as to the condition of the country is summed up in the following emphatic words:—

"When you leave the partial splendours of the capital and the great State establishments, what is it you find over this broad surface of a land which nature and climate have favoured beyond all others, once the home of all art and all civilisation? Look yourself; ask those who live there; deserted villages, uncultivated plains, banditti-haunted mountains, torpid laws, a corrupted administration, a disappearing people."—*Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters*, p. 184.

Mr. Spencer says:—

"With every desire to amend the condition of the rayah, the evil still remains—religious prejudice and caste—to frustrate the intentions of the most just and equitable Government, and must continue, so long as the laws are administered by a fanatic, ignorant Mussulman. The traveller is daily reminded of this in his intercourse with Turk and rayah—in the one he sees an overbearing ignorance, and in the other a humiliating degradation. In obedience to the old Mahometan laws, a rayah is restricted from using certain colours when he paints his house or decorates his person. He is not permitted to enter a town on horseback, if it is the residence of a Turkish dignitary. Should he meet with one during his route, he must descend till he passes, or escape by another direction. The meanest Turk holds the power to send him on an errand, or make him carry a package. If struck by one he dares not resent the injury; and should he by chance meet a Turkish lady, he is not allowed to look at her, since it is possible he may blight her good fortune with the evil eye. It is true

the higher class of rayahs, such as merchants and traders, inhabitants of towns, aware of their newly-acquired rights, do not humiliate themselves in the presence of a Mussulman; but the poor rayah of the village and the commune, ignorant of the privileges which have been accorded to him, still obeys, and, like a good Christian, if he is struck on the right cheek turns the left; and should he be sufficiently daring to assert his rights and refuse the homage required by the privileged class, the whip of the oppressor quickly reminds him that his emancipation is nominal so long as the Turk remains in authority." —*Spencer*, i. 244.

Mr. Crowe says :—

"Very little experience will suffice to show the traveller the immense difficulties in the way of the most liberal Turkish minister to elevate the Christian to anything like even fair tolerance. Row up the Golden Horn to visit the old Christian quarter of the Fanar. You will find oppression and forced humiliation stamped upon every house. Even that of the Patriarch, so powerful and so much talked of, is a dingy, diminutive prison, built of stone, indeed, for security, but craving pardon, by its air and its architecture of meanness, for daring to use so costly a material. The little church—the only church of the Christian within its walls—is equally begrimed, equally humble. The very population walk with a bowed expression; and this feeling of self-degradation, of which the European cannot divest himself in any part of Constantinople, becomes in the Fanar so painful that one is obliged to rush out of it. In doing so, and emerging from the gates, you enter, unawares perhaps, the Turkish suburb of Eyoub, famous for the mosque in which all the descendants of Mahomet gird them with the sword. If you dare approach that mosque, you will be stoned. You must sneak through the bye-lanes around, and steal a furtive peep. Curiosity more indiscreet might cost you your life."—*The Greek and the Turk*, pp. 183—9.

The Rev. Horatio Southgate thus describes what he himself witnessed in the streets of Constantinople long after the pretended "Reform" had commenced :—

"On the morning of the Paschal, after the public prayer was ended, it belonged to the soldiers to carry back the mats which had served them in their devotions, to the place whence they were taken. Instead, however, of performing the labour themselves, they dispersed through the crowds, and singling out the *rayahs* who happened to be there, compelled them to take the mats upon their shoulders and bear them. I saw one Armenian seized. He was a young man of respectable appearance, and refused when arrested to perform the scandalous task. Immediately some twenty soldiers set upon him, and attempted to beat him into submission. He resisted manfully for a few

minutes, while they, standing in a circle round him, kicked him from side to side, like a football. He offered to hire a porter to carry the burden, but they persisted in imposing the contumely upon him, and he walked away under his burden, sobbing with shame and vexation. *We know that the insult was forced upon him because he was a Christian.* I witnessed other scenes of a similar kind during the following days of the festival. *They filled me with the deepest indignation, but the oppression of rayahs became afterwards so familiar a sight to me, that the first effects gradually ceased.* It is only now, when looking back on those scenes from the favoured home of Christianity, that I feel a return of the first glow of indignation, and mourn, as I then sincerely mourned, over the desolate heritage of Zion in the land where she held her earliest and broadest sway."—*Travels in Turkey and Persia*, by Rev. Horatio Southgate, vol. i., pp. 113, 114.

The Author of "Eöthen" observed the same thing of Damascus.

"Until about a year or two years before the time of my going there, Damascus had kept up so much of the old bigot zeal against Christians, or rather against Europeans, that no one dressed as a Frank could have dared to show himself in the streets; but the firmness and temper of Mr. Farren, who hoisted his flag in the city as Consul-General for the district, had soon put an end to all intolerance of Englishmen. . . . In the principal streets there is a path for foot-passengers raised a foot or two above the bridle-road. Until the arrival of the British Consul-General, none but a Mussulman had been allowed to walk upon the upper way. Mr. Farren would not, of course, suffer that the humiliation of any such exclusion should be submitted to by an Englishman, and I always walked on the raised path as free and unmolested as if I had been in Pall Mall. The old usage was, however, maintained with as much strictness as ever against the Christian rayahs and Jews. Not one of these could have set his foot on the privileged path without endangering his life. I was walking one day, I remember, along the raised path, 'the path of the faithful,' when a Christian rayah from the bridle-road below saluted me with such earnestness, and craved so anxiously to speak and be spoken to, that he soon brought me to a halt. He had nothing to tell except only the glory and exaltation with which he saw a fellow-Christian stand level with the imperious Mussulmans. . . . His lips only whispered, and tremulously, but his flashing eyes spoke out their triumph more fiercely; 'I, too, am a Christian; my foes are the foes of the English. We are all one people, and Christ is our King.' "—*Eöthen*, p. 238.

Dr. Aiton says :—

"In the large cities, such as Smyrna and Constantinople, the Christians enjoy a certain amount of protection from the *surveillance* which is usually exercised over them; *but in the main streets of these cities fifty times have the*

Mussulmans spit at us, merely because we were Nazarenes; and in Palestine and other remote provinces we enjoyed the distinction of being stoned and hooted by a rabble of Mahometans at our heels, merely because we were 'Haji,' *i.e.*, pilgrims."—*The Drying up of the Euphrates*, p. 64.

Similar is Miss Martineau's records of her own experience :—

"At Nablous the bigotry of the people is so great that till of late years no Christian was permitted to set foot within the gates. Ibrahim Pasha punished the place severely, and made the people so desperately afraid of him that they observed his commands pretty much as if he had power in Syria still. One of his commands was, that Christians should not be ill-treated; so we entered Nablous, and rode through it to our encampment on the other side. *During our passage I had three slaps in the face from millet-stalks and other things thrown at me; and whichever way we looked the people were grinning, thrusting out their tongues, and pretending to spit."—Eastern Life, Present and Past*, p. 529.

"It was near Lizan," says Mr. Layard, "that occurred one of the most terrible incidents of the massacre, and an active mountaineer offering to lead me to the spot, I followed him up the mountain. Emerging from the gardens, we found ourselves at the foot of an almost perpendicular detritus of loose stones, terminated, about one thousand feet above us, by a wall of lofty rocks. Up this ascent we toiled for above an hour, sometimes clinging to small shrubs, whose roots scarcely reached the scanty soil below, at others crawling on our hands and knees; crossing the gullies to secure a footing, or carried down by the stones which we put in motion as we advanced. *We soon saw evidences of the slaughter. At first a solitary skull rolling down with the rubbish; then heaps of blanched bones, further up fragments of rotten garments. As we advanced, these remains became more frequent—skeletons, almost entire, still hung to the dwarf shrubs. I was soon compelled to renounce an attempt to count them. As we approached the wall of rock, the declivity became covered with bones, mingled with the long plaited tresses of the women, shreds of discoloured linen and well-worn shoes. There were skulls of all ages, from the child unborn to the toothless old man.* We could not avoid treading on the bones, as we advanced, and rolling them with the loose stones into the valley below. 'This is nothing,' exclaimed my guide, who observed me gazing with wonder on these miserable heaps; 'they are but the remains of those who were thrown from above, or sought to escape the sword by jumping from the rocks.' "—*Researches in Nineveh*, vol. i.

Well, Mr. Layard paid a second visit to the same region, and this is the description he gives of how the persecuted Nestorians fared under the shadow of their Turkish protectors :—

"Their church was in ruins—around were the charred remains of the burnt

cottages, and the neglected orchards overgrown with weeds. A body of Turkish troops had lately visited the village, and had destroyed the little that had been restored since the Kurdish invasions. The same taxes had been collected three times—and even four times over. The relations of those who had run away to escape from these exactions had been compelled to pay for the fugitives. *The chief had been thrown, with his arms tied behind his back, on a heap of burning straw, and compelled to disclose where a little money that had been saved by the villagers had been buried. The priest had been torn from the altar, and beaten before his congregation. Men showed me the marks of torture on their body, and of iron fetters round their limbs. For the sake of wringing a few piastres from this poverty-stricken people, all these deeds of violence had been committed by officers sent by the Porte to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan, whom they pretended to have released from the misrule of the Kurdish chiefs.*"

Take another passage from the same work :—

"The Nestorian community had greater wrongs to complain of than their Patriarch. The Turkish Government, so far from fulfilling the pledges given to the British Embassy, had sent officers to the mountains, who had grievously ill-treated and oppressed the Christian inhabitants. The taxes which the Porte had promised to remit for three years, in consideration of the losses sustained by the unfortunate Nestorians during the massacres, had not been, it is true, levied for that time, but had now been collected altogether, whole districts being thus reduced to the greatest misery and want. Every manner of cruelty and torture had been used to compel the suffering Christians to yield up the little property they had concealed from the rapacity of the Turkish authorities. The pasture and arable lands around their villages had been taken away from them and given to their Kurdish tyrants."

Mr. Crowe says again :—

"The question that naturally arises here is, What becomes of the female progeny of the poor in Constantinople? To this one is sorry to have to reply that the very poor in Constantinople have no progeny, because they can have no women. We know not exactly the number of females in the Turkish capital, which makes up a population of seven or eight hundred thousand; but the number, whatever it is, is very unfairly and unnaturally divided; for, whilst the harem of the rich teems with women, there are none in the lowest classes of the population, and but few even in the class above it. A wife is expensive in any country, but in Turkey more than anywhere else, inasmuch as a Turkish wife is not fit for or capable of labour of any kind. She could not sweep a room; she durst not go to market. She must have a slave to perform those menial offices. And there is besides the expense of decorating, covering, and immuring a wife—another necessity of Mahometanism. No labouring man, then—not even an artisan—can afford a wife. What is the consequence?

Concubinage? But there are no women. I will not pursue this subject into any more of its horrid developments, further than to observe that the lower orders of a Turkish city do not reproduce their kind—they die out on dung-hills."—*The Greek and the Turk*, pp. 208, 209.

Mr. McCulloch says :—

"Such is the Government which the great powers of Christendom, including, we are sorry to say, England, profess themselves desirous to maintain in all its integrity! We hardly, however, think that it is destined to a much longer endurance; and, happily, into whatever hands it may fall, there cannot be so much as the shadow of a doubt that the overthrow of the Turkish Government and power will be productive of the greatest possible advantage to the interests of humanity."—*Geographical Dictionary.*

Consul Saunders, under date of Prevesa, April 13th, 1853, writes :—

"The rural population, oppressed by fiscal exactions, and subjected to intolerable acts of violence and injustice, cannot be expected to entertain any but the most rancorous feelings towards their persecutors. The inhabitants of the greater part of these villages being, moreover, exclusively Christians, and seeing no other prospect of relief open to them, are continually thronging the foreign Consulates with a view to seek some friendly intervention."—Part i., p. 378.

Vice-Consul Baratti writes, Scutari, June 1st, 1853 :—

"All the desperate characters have raised their heads *again*, and acts of rapine and robbery are very frequent at the expense of the Christian. *Omar Pasha, the Governor of this province, is a Mussulman, and sees with perfect indifference all these excesses.* The Christians, who are exposed to the vengeance of their enemies, live in a continual state of alarm."—P. 379.

Consul Neale writes, Turnour, June 28th, 1853 :—

That "the Christian population of Bulgaria are opposed to any foreign occupation," and that, "were it not for the recurrence of these wanton and cold-blooded murders, and the consequent total insecurity of life, the Bulgarians would ask for arms to resist an invasion of the country."—P. 381.

Here are some further extracts from the letters of Consul Saunders, March, 1854 :—

"Among other cases brought forward was one where a mother had her son and daughter bound before her eyes and menaced with frightful tortures, boiling oil being prepared to pour upon them for this purpose, unless a large sum of money, which the family was supposed to possess, were immediately con-

signed; while the unfortunate mother, producing every species of valuable which she could collect, was with difficulty enabled to satisfy the rapacity of these ruffians, who eventually decamped with a large booty. It should be observed that the parties concerned in the outrages are mostly wealthy Mussulman proprietors, who scruple not to commit every species of atrocity on such occasions."—P. 127.

"From the details so obtained, I learn that the town of Paramithia, and a considerable number of Christian villages of that and the adjacent districts, have been plundered, and in many instances burnt to the ground, by the Mussulman Albanians, under the command of certain chiefs, whose names are known; that churches and monasteries have been pillaged and laid waste; women and children carried away captive; a vast amount of cattle and other property conveyed to distant parts; and many individuals, particularly old men, helpless infants, and females, tortured and slain in a manner too brutal to describe."—P. 152.

Here is a description, by an eye-witness, of the way in which the Turks treated our poor wounded soldiers, who had been shedding their blood to maintain the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire. It is from a little book entitled "Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy," published in 1863 :—

"Having access to windows commanding two wharves, we often saw the sick and wounded from Balaclava brought on shore. This was indeed a piteous spectacle—a long file of stretchers, each with a gaunt soldier, clothed in his tattered grey coat, lying helpless (and very often senseless) upon it, being borne by noisy, careless Turks, who really appeared to resort to little expedients in order to increase the sufferings of the soldier, such as placing the taller of the four bearers at the feet rather than the head; when about to rest, allowing the framework to fall with a jerk; or lifting it up unevenly, and thus rolling off the bleeding burden. On one occasion a wounded man was brought in, and two of the bearers had rested their poles on the ground while the other two still retained theirs, thus causing the patient to lie on his head and shoulders. On releasing him we found that he had fainted: a few moments longer would probably have placed him beyond recovery. On another occasion the Turkish bearers, while jesting among themselves, threw a sick man off the stretcher, cutting his face, and giving him a severe shock. When able to speak, his first words were, 'Those frightful men have murdered me.' He did not live long after, though the fall would not have killed a man in health."

Dr. Sandwith, in his volume entitled "Siege of Kars," after referring to a firman published in 1854, promising legal equality before the courts to the Christians, says :—

"Since then I have been nearly two years in the provinces, both in

European and Asiatic Turkey, and have seen Christians frequently wronged, but have never heard of their evidence being taken. Each pasha, when questioned concerning this firman, declares he knows nothing of it; no firman of the kind has ever been officially communicated to him. He must act according to his instructions; he cannot take cognisance of firmans conveyed through European consuls."—Pp. 165—7.

As an example of the way in which the feelings of the Sultan's Christian subjects were rudely trampled on by Mussulman intolerance, he gives the following faithful translation of a *teskere*, or permit of burial, given by the Cadi of Mardin in the spring of 1855, to a Christian applying for it. He has given and does give, adds Dr. Sandwith, scores of the like kind to all the Giaours in his jurisdiction.

"We certify to the priests of the Church of Mary, that the impure, putrefied, stinking carcase of Saideh, damned this day, may be concealed under ground.

"A.H. 1271.—Rejib. (Sealed)

"(March 29th, 1855.) EL SAID MEHURRED FAIZI."

"'What impression does the East produce on you?' said one gentleman to me.

"'I have had time,' I said, 'only to look at the exterior. I see a capital, the streets of which are impassable to wheels, and scarcely to be traversed on foot; I see a country without a road; I see a palace of the Sultan's on every promontory of the Bosphorus; I see vast tracts of unoccupied land, and more dogs than human beings; these appearances are not favourable to the Government or the people.'

"'If you have the misfortune,' he answered, 'as I have had, to live among Turks for between two and three years, your opinions will be still less favourable. In government and religion Turkey is a detritus. All that gave her strength, all that gave her consistency, is gone; what remains is crumbling into powder. The worst parts of her detestable religion—hatred of improvement and hatred of the unbeliever; the worst parts of her detestable government—violence, extortion, treachery, and fraud—are all that she has retained. Never was there a country that more required to be conquered. Our support merely delays her submission to that violent remedy.'

"'You think, then,' I said, 'that it must come to that?'

"'I can see,' he answered, 'no other solution. The Turk is utterly unimprovable. He hates change, and therefore he hates civilisation; he hates Europeans, he hates and fears all that they propose. There is not a word in the hatti-i-humayoon that does not disgust, or irritate, or alarm him. Nothing but force will oblige him to give it even the appearance of execution. And

what is the value of apparent reforms in a people without an aristocracy, without a middle class, without a public opinion, without the means of communication, without newspapers, without even a post-office; accustomed for four hundred years to plunder and oppress rayahs, and to be oppressed and plundered by sultans, pashas, cadis, and janissaries?'"—Pp. 27, 28.

"He gave a frightful account of the misgovernment of Turkish Armenia. . . . The amount of tyranny may be inferred from the depopulation. You see vast districts without an inhabitant, in which are the traces of a large and a civilised people, great works for irrigation now in ruins, and constant remains of deserted towns. There is a city near the frontier, with high walls and large stone houses, now absolutely uninhabited; it had once sixty thousand inhabitants."—Pp. 838—9.

"I do not believe that the Turks are more idle, wasteful, improvident, and brutal now than they were four hundred years ago. But it is only within the last fifty years that the effects of these qualities have shown themselves fully. When they first swarmed over Asia Minor, Roumelia, and Bulgaria, they seized on a country very populous and of enormous wealth. For three hundred and fifty years they kept on consuming that wealth, and wearing out that population. If a Turk wanted a house or a garden, he turned out a rayah; if he wanted money, he put a bullet into a handkerchief, tied it into a knot, and sent it to the nearest opulent Greek or Armenian. At last, having lived for three centuries and a half on their capital of things and of man, having reduced that rich and well-peopled country to the desert which you now see it, they find themselves poor. They cannot dig, to beg they are ashamed. They use the most mischievous means to prevent large families; they kill their female children, the conscription takes off the males, and they disappear. The only memorial of what fifty years ago was a popular Turkish village is a crowded burial-ground now unused.

"'As a medical man,' said Y., 'I, and perhaps, *I only*, know what crimes are committed in the Turkish part of Smyrna, which looks so gay and smiling, as its picturesque houses, enbosomed in gardens of planes and cypresses, rise up the hill. I avoid as much as I can the Turkish houses, that I may not be cognizant of them. Sometimes it is a young second wife who is poisoned by the elder one; sometimes a female child, whom the father will not bring up; sometimes a male killed by the mother to spite the father. Infanticide is rather the rule than the exception. No inquiry is made, no notice is taken by the police.'"—Pp. 211—12.

"A friend well acquainted with the whole of Turkey said to Mr. Senior as he was leaving Constantinople, 'You are going to Smyrna and to Greece. When you are at Smyrna visit Ephesus; you will ride through fifty miles of the most fertile soil, blest with the finest climate in the world. You will not see an inhabitant nor a cultivated field. This is Turkey. In Greece or in the Principalities you will find comparative numbers, wealth, and population.

They have been misgoverned; they have been the seat of war; but they have thrown off the Turk.'"—P. 148.

Letter to the Rev. Ernest Hawkins :—

"Few of you in England know the real horrors of this country. You will see what I mean when I tell you my intention of getting a number of tracts in Turkish written or lithographed, to be distributed by a Turk on the bridges, &c. The tract is to consist of such passages as the history of Sodom and Gomorrah. What can we hope to do with this people? One Englishman, who has to do with multitudes of them, reckons those who are innocent of this hideous vice at one or two in a hundred. A Turkish teacher told a European that those who are guiltless as to that are two in a thousand."

"But all these combined will not fully account for the fact that the Turks are rapidly becoming extinct. . . . The evil lies far deeper. It is one, however, which cannot be laid bare. The hideous, revolting profligacy of all classes, and almost every individual in every class, is the main cause of the diminution. This is a canker which has eaten into the very vitals of society. It is one, however, which has taken so loathsome a form that no pen dares describe the immoral state of Turkish society. It must be abandoned to vague generalities, for happily the imagination cannot picture the abominations which are fast exterminating the whole Turkish race. . . . I have the evidence now before me of persons at present resident in Turkey, as well as of English officers high in the civil service, whose duties have made them acquainted with the real state of society in Turkey; and in addition to these, I have a voluminous report addressed to me by a distinguished foreigner, formerly a colonel in the Turkish service, and from the varied offices he has filled in that country, of all men one of the most competent witnesses. I have all this evidence before me, but it is so disgusting and obscene that I dare not make use of it. The satires of Juvenal and Petronius Arbiter are decorous in comparison. Students may remember how rabbinical writers describe the sins of the Ammonites and other inhabitants of the land of Canaan, who for their revolting sins were driven out by the children of Israel. That description gives but a partial picture of what is the present state of Turkish society. The Cities of the Plain were destroyed for sins which are the common, normal, every-day practice of this people."—*The Christians of Turkey*, pp. 62—4.

But in the following July the explosion did indeed take place in the fearful atrocities in Syria, by which a hundred and fifty towns and villages were destroyed, ten thousand people were massacred, seventy thousand reduced to starvation, and property destroyed or plundered to the estimated value of four or five millions sterling. The Druses were the immediate agents in the

work of horror, but there is the clearest evidence to prove that the Turkish officials, civil and military, not only did not attempt to repress the wholesale murder and pillage going on under their eyes in the Lebanon and at Damascus—that not only did they connive at them openly and obviously—but that they instigated and encouraged them.

"At Hasbeya on the 6th many of the soldiers were seen leaving; then the unfortunate people, when it was too late, saw clearly how treacherously they had been deceived. They rushed into the outer court and entreated to be let out. The signal was given, the gates thrown open, and in rushed the Druses, armed with any weapon they could seize, and then commenced an indiscriminate slaughter of all the males. Some, indeed, made their way through the door to the outer gate, only to be seized by the Turkish soldiery. Nor were these passive only in the transaction. Many Christians whom I have examined have sworn to me that they saw the soldiers themselves taking part in the slaughter; and the subsequent behaviour of these brutal troops to the women was savage in the extreme. From the wounds I have seen, both on the living and the dead, it would appear that they went to work with the most systematic cruelty—ten, twelve, and fourteen deep cuts on the body of one person is not unfrequent. Some of the wounds show that they were made with blunt instruments. In short, everything was used which came to hand, and, according to the nature of the weapon, hands and limbs were cut off, or brains dashed out, or bodies mangled.

"Of all the men in the Serai, some forty or fifty only escaped. Women the Druses did not slaughter, nor, for the most part, I believe, ill-use; that was left for Turks and Moslems to do, and they did it.

"Little boys of four and five years old were not safe. These would be seized from the mother and dashed on the ground, or torn to pieces before her face; or, if her grasp was too tight, they would kill it on her lap, and in some cases, to save further trouble, mother and child were cut down together. Many women have assured me that the Turkish soldiers have taken their children one leg in each hand and torn them in two."

At Sidon, on the 1st of June, the Christians were attacked in similar manner by the Bashi-Bazouks and other Moslems:—

"For several days the slaughter continued. No Christian outside the town was in safety. If a man, or a male child, he was cut down; if a woman, she was sure to be brutally ill-used.

"On the morning of the 21st the Druses collected round the town. One of their leaders came to the Serai and desired to speak with the Governor. A conversation was carried on in a low voice by means of an interpreter, for the

Turk did not know Arabic. At last a question was asked to which they heard the Governor give the answer 'Hepsi'—('Ab' in Turkish)—*i.e.*, 'all.' Thereupon the Druse disappeared, but in a few moments the gate was thrown open and in rushed the fiends, cutting down and slaughtering every male, the soldiers co-operating. . . . I have good reason to believe, after a careful comparison of all the accounts, that from 1,100 to 1,200 males actually perished in that one day. . . . I myself can testify that the accounts are not much exaggerated. I travelled over most of the open country before the war was over, and came to Deir-el-Kamar a few days after the massacre. Almost every house was burnt and the streets crowded with dead bodies, most of them stripped and mutilated in every possible way. My road led through the town, and through some of the streets my horse could not even pass, for the bodies were literally piled up. Most of those I examined had many wounds, and in each case was the right hand either entirely or nearly cut off; the poor wretch, in default of weapons, having instinctively raised his arm to parry the blow aimed at him. I saw little children of not more than three or four years old stretched on the ground, and old men with grey beards."

The horrible occurrences which have been detailed above were to be surpassed in a few days at Damascus. The outbreak, which the Governor, Ahmed Pasha, made not the least attempt to check, occurred on the 9th of July. The whole Christian quarter was ruthlessly plundered and burnt to the ground; 2,000 dead bodies lay unburied amid the ruins, and 20,000 houseless wanderers, whose only crime was that they were followers of Christ, were left to live on charity and ask for justice at the hands of Europe.

"Hitherto the taxes have been paid in kind, a method which always gives the gatherer much power to extort bribes, since he can refuse to value the present standing corn until half of it be spoiled. But Turkish tax-farmers do not confine themselves to such dry paths of cheating.

"The following is an instance of what constantly occurs:—Two men agreed to keep a flock between them—the one in summer on the mountains, the other in winter on the plain. The tax-gatherer compels the first to pay for the whole, promising that he will ask nothing of the other; he then goes to the second, and, with a similar promise, forces him likewise to pay for all. In like manner the Christian can be compelled to pay twice over for exemption from the army, if the tax-gatherer declare his first receipt forged."

"Since writing the above, we have found these and other stories related at length in Mrs. Walker's 'Through Macedonia to the Albanian Lakes.' She also says, 'The Christians of Ochrida complain bitterly of the murders of their co-religionists which have taken place in that neighbourhood within the last three years. No less than thirty lives have been sacrificed, but in no single

instance have the assassins been brought to justice' (page 211). An American missionary told us that near Eski-Sagra, in Bulgaria, where he was stationed, from seventy to one hundred Christians were killed annually by Mussulmans without inquiry being made."—P. 76.

Miss Irby, after describing their visit to a school at the Monastery of Gratchanitza, says :—

"Before leaving the schoolroom, we ventured a very earnest remonstrance as to the mode in which the pupils had greeted us. At our entrance they had literally fallen down at our feet, and that with a sort of grovelling action, which, if not revolting, would have been ludicrous. We asked how in the world they came to suppose we should wish to be thus received. Their teacher answered, 'The Turks taught it us; their dignitaries require us Christians to prostrate ourselves before them.'

"The Christian community of Novi-Bazar is at the mercy of the Mussulmans. They enter houses both by day and night, take what they choose, and behave as they will. Raise an arm or speak a word, and you bring on yourself death or the loss of a limb. Make a representation to the authorities, and you are ruined by the revenge of those of whom you have dared to complain."

Captain Warren says :—

"It is not the Christians alone of Syria that the Turk oppresses: the Arab Moslem is, if not equally, yet most hardly used. Many a time have the Arab Moslems said to me, 'When will you take this country and rid us of our oppressors? anything is better than their rule.' For the Turk has no affinity of race or language to connect him with, or give him a right to rule, the Arab. He has no power of sympathising with the Semitic races, and his religion is but in name. The Arab, if I may use such an expression, is a Moslem by nature; the Turk cannot become a Moslem by art.

"He is sent to Palestine to govern bad. He is given but a small salary and is obliged to squeeze the people in order to pay his own officials and to live, to recoup himself for what he has paid for his appointment in the past, and to carry away with him something for the future wherewith he may buy a higher appointment, or purchase immunity for the consequences of his evil deeds, should complaints be made against his rule.

"The Turk can never govern Palestine well; and until he departs the country must remain half desert, half prison; for it is his policy to leave it so. He wants it to continue impoverished, so that it may not tempt the cupidity of stronger nations. This was brought home to me once, when, in conversation with an eminent Turk, I was pressing the advantages of a bridge across the Jordan and other matters. He answered me warmly, 'We want no discoveries; we want no attention paid to Palestine; we want no roads. Leave the place alone. If it becomes rich, we shall lose it; if it remains poor, it will continue

in our hands. God be praised.' In vain I urged that if the country were well governed there would be no occasion for taking it from Turkey. His idea was, 'If we make it valuable, you will want it. Let us keep it in poverty.' Well, he tries to keep it in poverty, and succeeds to some extent in reality, and to a great extent in appearance. . . .

"The fruit-trees are taxed, even from the day on which they are planted, year by year, though they may not be productive for a long time to come; so that, if a man plants a thousand fig-trees or olives, he pays nearly ten pounds sterling per annum for years before they yield him any profit. For what purpose can such a system be put in force, except for retarding cultivation, and keeping back the country? It certainly cannot be for the purpose of getting a revenue, for with such a law few will plant.

"The people are treated with equal cruelty in regard to the gathering in of their corn. When they have thrashed and winnowed, they leave it heaped up on the floor for the government inspector to see and take his share; and often it happens that a large portion is decayed or destroyed before he arrives."—*Underground Jerusalem*, pp. 449—54.

"Unexplored Syria" is the title of a work published by Captain Burton, who was for a considerable time British Consul at Damascus.

"Captain Burton," says the reviewer in the *Times*, "is eminently conscientious and accurate in his observations, and he tells us quite enough to confirm us in the idea that the administration of Syria, as of other Turkish provinces, is execrable. So mercilessly have the villagers been oppressed and fleeced by the tax-gatherers, that for a hundred and fifty years past there has been a steady exodus from the more settled districts to the remote settlements that look towards the Euphrates desert. We have the statement that in the last five years of Raschid Pasha's administration no less than seventeen mountain villages were depopulated, while in a single autumn between seven hundred and eight hundred families had taken their flight to the eastward."

"We can hardly wonder," says Captain Burton, "at the exodus when we are told that nearly half the settlements of the Jaydur district, the ancient Jhiræa—eleven out of twenty-four—have been within twelve months ruined by the usurer and the tax-gatherer. . . . It is hardly necessary to dwell on the short-sighted and miserable management which drives an industrious peasantry from its hearths and homes to distant settlements, where defence is much more easy than offence, and where, as Cromwell said of Pease Burn, ten men to hinder are better than a hundred to make their way. This upon a small scale is a specimen of the system which keeps down to a million and a half the population of a province which, though not larger than Lancashire and Yorkshire united, in the days of Strabo and Josephus supported its ten millions and more."—Pp. 179—181.

Mr. Henry C. Barkley is a gentleman who has been engaged for many years in connection with railway work in Turkey. In his work recently published, entitled, "Between the Danube and Black Sea," he records principally his experiences in Bulgaria. Of the Bulgarians he speaks in terms of commendation as a quiet, industrious, honest people; but, like all other travellers, he testifies to the cruel and oppressive character of Turkish rule. He says:—

"The Bulgarians, and also the Turkish villagers, are loud in their complaints of the injustice and tyranny of the Turkish officials. All—from the governor-general to the hangman—think it right and just, when on a journey, to quarter themselves on the peasants, without ever thinking of paying; and at the same time they demand the services of their host and his family, and the best of everything there is to be had. The largest and most prosperous of the villages are built as far as possible from the main roads leading to and from the fortified towns, such as Widdin, Rustchuk, Shumla, &c. If they are on the line of march, the troops live on them at free quarters, their carts and beasts are seized for transport services, and the owners themselves forced to accompany them as drivers, and are obliged to find food for themselves and fodder for the cattle, for all of which they receive no recompense.

"To assist in the construction of the line which passed by the village, I caused a road to be made across the marsh, and a wooden bridge thrown over the brook. The first night after the bridge was completed it was cut down; and, on making inquiries about it, a Turk told me that, rather than live with this easy access to the road, the inhabitants, both Turks and Bulgars, would burn their houses and migrate to some spot where Turkish officials, Turkish troops, and, above all, Turkish zaptiehs, could not so easily get at them. 'Above all, zaptiehs,' for they are the constant and never-ending curse of all the villages, whether Turkish or Bulgar. They are recruited from the very lowest and most ruffianly of the Turks. Many, if not most of them, have been brigands, and all are robbers. Their pay (even when they get it) is not sufficient to support them, and therefore they depend on their *position* to secure the comforts of life. They *live* on the peasants, and all they have, from their pipe to their horse, has been robbed from them. Over and over again I have seen every woman and girl of an entire Christian village disappear as if by magic at the approach of a zaptieh; and when he enters the village all the men stand staring about, watching to see what may take place, like a flock of sheep when a strange dog comes among them."—Preface, pp. vi.—viii.

"The Pasha of Varna had some time before this sent orders to a distant village for a supply of wood. Five arabas, each with a Bulgar driver, arrived at dusk, just as the storm commenced. They inquired where they should deliver the wood, but no one knew exactly where the woodstack had better be

made, and the pasha's servants, fearing if it were discharged at the wrong place that they should have to remove it themselves, determined to do nothing till the morning. The arabas were therefore escorted into a large barrack-yard surrounded with high walls, and there locked in for the night. The cries and shouts for help from the five men were disregarded, and no further notice was taken of them till the next morning, when they were found huddled together in the snow, all dead. No matter; they were Bulgar dogs, and it was Kismet! No one was punished; the wood was not paid for; but payment for the keep of the wretched bullocks was extorted from the friends of the dead men when they came to fetch them away a month later."

Mr. Evans says:—

"A village will occasionally band together to defend themselves from these extortioners. Thereupon the tithe-farmer applies to the civil power, protesting that if he does not get the full amount from the village, he will be unable in his turn to pay the Government. The zaptiehs, the factotums of the Turkish officials, are immediately quartered on the villagers, and live on them, insult their wives, and ill-treat their children. With the aid of these gentry, all kinds of personal tortures are applied to the recalcitrant. In the heat of summer men are stripped naked and tied to a tree, smeared over with honey or other sweetstuff, and left to the tender mercies of the insect world. For winter extortion it is found convenient to bind people to stakes, and leave them barefooted to be frostbitten: or at other times they are shoved into a pigstye, and cold water poured on them. A favourite plan is to drive a party of rayahs up a tree, or into a chamber, and then smoke them with green wood. Instances are recorded of Bosniac peasants being buried up to their heads in earth, and left to repent at leisure. I will quote a single instance of these practices, communicated by the Princess Julia of Servia to the author of 'Servia and the Servians:'—'A poor woman, frantic with agony, burst into the palace of the princess at Belgrade. She had been assessed by the Turkish authorities of a village in Bosnia of a sum which she had no means of paying. . . *She was smoked.* This failed of extracting the gold. She begged for a remission, and stated her inability to pay. In answer, she was tossed into the river Drina, and after her were thrown her two infant children—one of four years old, the other of two. Before her eyes, notwithstanding her frantic efforts to save them, her children perished. Half-drowned and insensible, she was dragged to land by a Servian peasant. She made her way to Belgrade, believing, from the character of the princess for humanity, that she would aid her. Of course, to do so was out of the question."

And now we close with the testimony of the last traveller who has visited Turkey—Sir George Campbell:—

"When," he says, "we come to political rights and trusts, then I say that

at this moment, and now perhaps more than at any previous period of Turkish history, the Christians are placed in a humiliating and enthralled position, which has no parallel in the world. Think of a system under which no Christian can bear arms in any capacity, not even the bâton of a policeman, nor exercise any executive authority, even the pettiest; under which not only the whole army, but the whole executive administration—the whole police down to the village watchmen—are all of the dominant Mahometan minority, while the Christian majority are entirely and without exception a subject people! Compare this state of things with the liberal government of the Mogul Emperors in India, where the Hindoos were employed in thousands and tens of thousands, both in the army and the civil administration, where many of the chief ministers were Hindoos, and where one of the Emperors even went so far as to appoint a Hindoo General to be Governor of Mahometan Cabul. Compare it with the every-day and uncoerced practices of native States in India at this day. There is hardly a Hindoo State which has not many Mahometans in its higher offices, and hardly a Mahometan State which has not many Hindoos in similar offices."

PROFESSOR MARTENS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

Extract from an article in the "Revue de Droit International," by M. F. Martens, Professor of the University of St. Petersburg.—In 1829 "the Emperor Nicholas instituted a secret committee, under the presidency of Prince Kotschoubey, and composed of the highest functionaries of the Empire, to study the position of Turkey, and to fix the conduct of Russia in case the Porte ceased to exist. In the sitting of September 4th, 1829, Count Nesselrode read the memorandum stating 'that the preservation of this Empire (Ottoman) was more useful than injurious to the true interests of Russia, and that no state of things which one could substitute for it could counterbalance for us the advantage of having a feeble state as neighbour;' but if the fall of the Turkish Empire is inevitable, Russia should invite her allies '*to deliberate in common on this great question.*'

"The committee had also before it a remarkable letter addressed by Comte Capo d'Istrias to the Emperor Nicholas, on the 31st March, 1828. The celebrated Russian diplomatist, become president of regenerated Greece, proposed the following plan for the political reconstruction of the Balkan peninsula. The Ottoman Empire was to be replaced by five states of the second class. These states were to be (1) the Duchy or Kingdom of Dacia, formed of Moldavia and Wallachia; (2) the Kingdom of Servia, composed of Bulgaria, Servia, and Bosnia; (3) Thrace and Macedonia, properly so called, with the isles of the Propontis and those of Finbros, Samothrace, and Thasos, would form the Kingdom of Macedonia; (4) Epirus, comprising the provinces of

Upper and Lower Albania, would form the Kingdom of Epirus; (5) finally, Greece, properly so called, from the river of the Peneus, in Thessaly, to the town of Arta, including all the islands, would form the Greek state. . . Constantinople was to become a free city, and the centre of the Confederation, which was to unite all the five states of the Balkan peninsula, and the Confederation was to be represented at Constantinople by a Congress. Count Pozzo di Borgo and M. de Daschkof brought forward amendments and critical observations relative to this plan; they feared that the free city would not have the power to keep the straits shut to vessels of war which might have the object of attacking the Russian coast in the Black Sea. From the Protocols of the sittings, it appears that the committee considered it inopportune to decide on any fixed plan before the destruction of the Ottoman Empire became an accomplished fact, but they unanimously resolved—

"1. 'That the advantages of the maintenance of the Ottomar Empire in Europe are greater than the evils it presents, and that its fall would be therefore contrary to the true interests of Russia. That consequently it would be prudent to seek to prevent it by profiting by all the chances which may still present themselves to conclude an honourable peace.' Peace, accordingly, was made at Adrianople."

This, however, was in my opinion as unwise and discreditable a policy as that which England still pursues, and I trust and believe that the Russian nation will insist on the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, and the reconstruction of the Greek Empire, even if they remain under the delusion that it is contrary to their interests instead of being, as I have shown, in perfect accordance with them.

"THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE BUFFOON" (LORD BEACONSFIELD).

POLITICAL SQUIB, 1874.

To understand the unfortunate mischances by which the Turcophile Conservative party are now in power, and the Russophile Liberal party in opposition, I subjoin the following satirical political squib from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which was then less favourable to Conservatism than it has now become.

"Alas! we are out of our places—
It is but too true, lackaday!
Imagine our woebegone faces,
As we are all packing away.
On Monday our colours we struck—struck—
Resigning the next afternoon;
And all at the word of a Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.*

"I'm told the last Cabinet Council
Was something too painful to see;
And, though you're aware he don't bounce ill,
You really would feel for poor G.;†
He's awfully down on his luck—luck,
And if some his wisdom impugn,
He's better at least than a Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

* Mr. Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, formerly M.P. for Buckinghamshire.
† Mr. Gladstone.

"There Goschen was rending his garments,
Here Cardwell was tearing his hair;
And who shall discover the torments
That agonized poor Aberdare?
The Chancellor showed better pluck—pluck,
Though he, too, was ready to swoon,
He thought how he'd shunted the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"Old Halifax pining with Forster,
Their visages full of distress,
Proved how the sharp pangs of remorse stir
The muscles of men in a mess.
Poor G., who his bottle would suck—suck,
Confessed he was in a balloon
When he tipped such a chance to the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"Then Granville and Bright in a corner
Sat sorrowful, sulky, and glum;
While Kimberley, even forlorner,
Stood moodily biting his thumb;
But Lowe, as malicious as Puck—Puck,
Flounced like a cantankerous loon,
And scoffed at both G. and the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"There was Hartington drying his eyes,
And Fortescue making his moan;
While Stansfeld, in vacant surprise,
Did nothing but grumble and moan.
Argyll seemed as if he'd been struck—struck
By fatuous beams from the moon;
So blank did he look 'bout the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"Poor G., 'midst the weeping and wailing
Attempted their feelings to calm,
And promote a return to plain sailing
By giving the tone to a psalm:
But the words in his throttle they stuck—stuck
Besides, he'd forgotten the tune,
Put out, as it were, by the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"The Council then broke up in sorrow,
Contrition, and mourning, and tears,
All bitterly feeling the morrow
From power would exclude them for years.
If but to the old house they'd stuck—stuck,
And proffered the Income Tax boon,
They thought they'd have diddled the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"But now I must finish my letter,
My pitiful story I've told;
I trust that we all shall be better
For a time of it 'out in the cold.
How we have been running a muck—muck,
We see by this inopportune
Unexpected success of the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"You know that I am not a novice
In many affairs of the world—
I've long felt that some day from office
We'd be ignominiously hurled.
Poor G. overloaded his truck—truck,
For nobody cared a doubloon,
And thus he's been thrashed by the Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon."

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE AID OF THE WOUNDED IN WAR AND THE STAFFORD HOUSE COMMITTEE.

NOTHING can be more discreditable, unfair, and even illegal than the conduct of the National Society for the Aid of the Wounded in the present war, but it is only what might have been expected, considering that the management of that Society is in much the same incompetent and one-sided hands as during the Franco-German war.

I was glad to observe in the *Times* a most excellent letter, from Mr. Auberon Herbert, in which he strongly and justly animadverts at the conduct of the Committee, dated 29th July, and which, though the month of August has arrived, the Committee have been unable to refute. He states :—

SIR,—I feel assured that my friend, Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, when placed in a position of responsibility, would not consciously give his approval to any act of partiality; but I think that his letter of Friday will confirm the opinion that the action taken by his Committee will result in a very unequal distribution of supplies as between the Turks and their opponents, whether Russian or Montenegrin.

From Colonel Loyd-Lindsay's letter we may conclude that the Committee of the National Aid Society have rested from their labours since they despatched their ship to the Black Sea. But who are the persons likely to draw advantage from this ship? The Turks have, and from the beginning of the war have had, the command of the Black Sea; and whether the good ship operates on the coast of Asia Minor or of Roumelia and Bulgaria, it is almost certain that the supplies would have to pass

through Turkish hands before any part of them could reach Russian troops. We are obliged, then, to conclude that the equitable distribution of these supplies will depend upon the facilities which the Turks may give to some English surgeon who, dropped from the ship, presents himself at some point or other of the coast, and innocently demands to be forwarded through to the Russian lines. Your correspondent from Shumla described the other day the fate which awaited the stores forwarded by the Stafford House Committee. He writes:—

"Shumla, July 8.

"There are 88 wounded in Rustchuk, and the English doctors are not allowed to attend them. All are packed off with broken legs and arms, without being dressed, in a most dreadful state, for Constantinople. Soldiers implore the English doctors to extract bullets, but they are helpless, as 28 cases of medical stores sent by the Stafford House Committee have been seized by the Turkish doctor-in-chief at Rustchuk, in spite of the protest of English doctors. They have not been distributed, and are practically useless. Battalions are marched off without medical stores, while this man keeps everything under lock and key. All stores should be consigned to the English doctors."

If it is a matter of such difficulty to succeed in applying for the use of the Turks themselves what is sent out from England, the Committee must indeed be of a hopeful disposition if they are prepared to believe that through the Turks they can also reach the Russians. I can confidently say that during the Franco-German War it would have been no easy or pleasant task to have forwarded supplies through Paris to the German troops, and the experiment of supplying one army through another army will not be easier because one of those armies happens to be the Turkish army. When supplies for the Turks were sent by the Society through Belgrade during the Servian War, we received accounts of the unfavourable impression created by such an arrangement, and yet Belgrade was removed from the field of war, and, comparatively speaking, might almost be said to have been in a state of peace. Moreover, it is an entirely different operation to ship stores at Belgrade and send them down the Danube to Turkish territory, to landing stores in the rear of the Turkish lines, for the purpose of passing them through the Turkish troops on

to the Russian army. Of course when the Turkish troops have retreated from northern Bulgaria, when the seaports are in Russian hands, when the Turkish fleet definitely resigns this part of the seaboard, it may be possible for the ship, should any stores have been reserved in view of such a future, to communicate directly with the Russians; but that will not prevent a large number of persons from feeling that the natural and equitable course would have been to send one part of the supplies through Constantinople to the rear of the Turkish Army and another part down the Danube to the rear of the Russian Army.

Colonel Loyd-Lindsay can hardly feel satisfied with his own excuse about Montenegro. Had some one else offered it he would readily perceive that it crawls upon even a smaller number of legs than usually belongs to the race of excuses. The resources of the Society are not inexhaustible; therefore nothing can be done for this little State. If I remember rightly, £70,000 was in the hands of the Committee at the beginning of the Servian War, and of this not £10,000, not £5,000, not £1,000 could be spared for a country which has such claims both on account of its want of resources and, as your correspondent pointed out, the value to the community of each life. The Society, says Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, cannot operate "in every place at the same time;" but that is no reason why the Society should place all its eggs in one basket, send one ship out to drift about the Black Sea, with a fair chance of not seeing a Russian, unless he be a prisoner in the hands of the Turks, during its whole cruise, and then remain with hands folded while war is going on and battles are being fought in places not accessible from the Black Sea. "At the same time," says Colonel Loyd-Lindsay; but it was in June that he describes his ship, and we have now reached the middle of July. I cannot think that there would have been any need to make time or place responsible for the present small results if the Committee had striven to make the most of their fund; but their apparent apathy gives some excuse for the harsh belief that, like other distributors of endowments, they have become bored with the task of dispensing the fund that is

in their hands, and that ships to the Black Sea, irrespective of where the principal fighting is going on, suggest themselves as one of the least troublesome ways of getting rid in large sums of what so inconveniently remains. No grounds for such a belief ought to exist, and it is for the Committee at once to remove them. It is only fair to add that whatever blame falls to the share of the Committee some of it must rest on the public for having shown so little interest in the work of the Society; and I believe that the best course to be adopted would be for the Committee at once to call together a meeting of old subscribers and others willing, if only appealed to, to become subscribers, and reanimate a movement which has nearly passed from slumber into non-existence.

I regret to add that Dr. Sandwith has left England.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Ashley Arnewood Farm, Lymington. AUBERON HERBERT.

The funds of the National Society were subscribed on the understanding that they should be expended as nearly as possible equally on the wounded of both sides in every successive war as long as any portion of them remained, and it seems to me a signal breach of faith to the subscribers, of whom I am one, to adopt measures by which, as Mr. Herbert points out, all or nearly all which is sent out will be monopolised by the Turks, because the "West-end" is almost to a man anti-Russian, and the overwhelming majority even opposed to the Turkish Christians.

The Stafford House Committee is also liable to the gravest censure for confining their operations to the Turks alone, as this is a breach of neutrality and practically levying war against Russia, one of the oldest and best allies of England, besides being a wanton insult to that great country, and it is more than doubtful whether the course they are pursuing is not even injurious to the Turks, since they are encouraged to depend chiefly on their assistance for the care of the sick and wounded, and as their soldiers seldom if ever receive a farthing of pay and are ill-clothed and half-starved, the sum which the Stafford House Committee have contributed, and which the Turks have saved by their disgraceful

and unparalleled inhumanity to their own wounded (to say nothing of their unfortunate wounded enemies, who may fall by a horrible misfortune into their hands), would maintain for a considerable time a battalion of soldiers who may probably wound a considerable number of Russians and Montenegrins, and thus the Stafford House Committee not only do not relieve the Russian wounded but indirectly increase their numbers. The quotation, however, in Mr. Herbert's letter from the *Times* correspondent at Shumla, shows that after all the Turks not only will not attend to their own wounded, but will not even allow the doctors and agents of the Stafford House Committee to aid them, acting, I suppose, on the principle, "Timeo Anglos et dona ferentes," and the result of Turkish incompetence and inhumanity to their own people is, according to the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*, that the Sultan told Mehemet Ali, his renegade German generalissimo, that according to the report of Namyk Pasha the Turkish army had lost the appalling and unprecedented proportion of forty per cent. of their numbers in consequence of bad food and bad management.

The Russians, on the other hand, spare no expense in reference to their own wounded and those of the Turks, and in evidence of this I now quote from the *Times* correspondent:—"An American surgeon, who is inspecting the hospital arrangements at Bucharest, pronounces them all that could be desired, and expresses his surprise to find all the modern improvements for caring for sick and wounded men in full operation here in the East. The Russian field ambulance trains are very extensive, and contain complete arrangements for the comfort of the wounded."

Since I wrote the foregoing paragraphs I formed one of a deputation, consisting of some members of Parliament and others, who waited on the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, &c., in order to urge that an equal sum should be expended on the Russian and Montenegrin wounded to that which was being laid out on the Turkish wounded, and that it would be fair to reckon the whole costs of the ship and cargo sent by them to the Black Sea to the debit of the Turkish share of our bounty.

In the course of a long discussion, Colonel Loyd-Lindsay

feebly attempted to justify the one-sided course the committee had adopted in breach of justice, the statutes of the Society, the wish of a large portion of the subscribers, of whom I am one, and the laws of neutrality—since assisting the Turkish side only is precisely the same thing as placing soldiers in the field against Russia—but he gave no explanation of the reasons why annual general meetings of the society and elections of members of the committee were not regularly held, in accordance with the rules. He added that when assistance had been tendered to the Russians they had replied that they did not require it, but that if we chose to send any stores they would accept them, provided they were not clogged with the condition of their being distributed by the agents of the society; and he stated that it was contrary to their regulations to give stores in this manner. Upon this I stated that it was highly creditable that the Russians, with a proper sense of national dignity, as long as they believed they had ample resources to meet the demands of a war which, after the passage by the Russians of the Danube and of the Balkans, seemed on the point of terminating, should have been averse to receive contributions offered with a bad grace by persons who were notoriously hostile to them, and avowed partisans of their enemies; but that the Russian losses at the battle of Plevna, the total change in the plan of the campaign, and the probable protraction of the war, had now shown them that their resources were inadequate, and that the Empress of Russia had caused a letter to be written to Mr. Lewis Farley, on the stamped paper of her "Chancellerie," and sealed with her seal, saying that the Red Cross Society would "receive with gratitude" any contributions from the league for the protection of the Christians; and of course it follows that they will equally receive with gratitude contributions from any other quarter, if tendered *in a suitable manner*. Mr. Farley has also received a letter from Baroness Rahden, the president of the St. Petersburg branch of the Red Cross Society, to the same effect, and these letters I afterwards sent for the perusal of the committee of the National Aid Society. I added that in the Franco-German war I had myself distributed for the National Society a

considerable quantity of medicines and other stores, without any supervision on my part or that of any official of the society, in which I was confirmed by Sir Henry Havelock, who had been for a long time engaged in succouring the sick and wounded out of his own private funds, for which, on his return, he obtained very scant acknowledgment from the society.

The secretary then asserted that he had seen the evil consequences of stores being given during the Franco-German war without supervision, for some of them were wasted, others spoilt, and another portion made use of by unwounded combatants in perfect health; and, in short, the society took time to consider their answer.

It appears to me that it is most injudicious and absurd for the National Aid Society, or any other society for the relief of the wounded, to purchase any stores whatever unless the officials of the society with the Turkish, Russian, and Montenegrin armies write or telegraph that particular stores are required, and the only stores they should send out unasked are bales of lint and other articles contributed to them in kind, provided they will bear the cost of carriage, which, as Colonel Lindsay admitted, is not always the case. In the Franco-German war I was asked for, say biscuits, wine, and Liebig's essence of meat at one place, being the only thing they wanted; and I could only offer them lint, medicine, or surgical instruments, none of which could be eaten or drunk, so that wounded men may have died who might have lived if I had had enough money to buy as much as was wanted, of which there was plenty to be purchased in the town.

I feel certain that even if wine, biscuits, and other articles which would be acceptable to unwounded combatants were handed over to those who are at the head of the agencies of the Russian Red Cross Society at the headquarters of the Russian armies, they would willingly give and honourably fulfil the pledge that nothing whatever which the National Society gave for the wounded should be distributed to unwounded men in health; but if the National Society consider that these Russian gentlemen, who are often their equals, and sometimes their superiors, in social standing, are so

dishonest as to violate such a pledge, how can their agent see, after he has given the wine and biscuits to the doctor or nurses of a hospital, that every morsel of biscuit and glass of wine is given exclusively to the sick and wounded, and that even the doctors and officials take none themselves ?

I can imagine the Turks making free with such stores, as their men are half starved and live almost entirely on bread, whilst their superiors are notoriously corrupt, and Redif Pasha, the Minister at War, was dismissed lately for making a shameful profit by sending rotten biscuits to the Turkish army; but the Russians, who are well fed, and whose officers, as well as the members of the Russian Red Cross Society, are often nobles of old family and large fortune, are incapable of such baseness.

Besides, nothing would be easier than to send only such stores as unwounded soldiers in health would not accept even if offered; and I suppose even the National Aid Society will hardly allege that unwounded soldiers made free with their castor oil and senna in the Franco-German war; and if they did it would scarcely contribute to the efficiency of the men in battle, and would be a breach of neutrality highly acceptable to the Turks.

The committee of the Sick and Wounded Russian and Montenegrin Soldiers' Relief Fund, of which I am chairman, send all our contributions in money, and not in kind, directly to the "chancellerie" of the Empress of Russia, and the Turkophiles will hardly venture to suppose that she will misappropriate it and apply it in aid of her pin money. I have no doubt that every pound sent by our society, which has no expenditure for secretary, offices, doctors, or agents, and which does not buy useless stores at the dearest rate, will go as far when expended by the Russians as treble the money tardily and reluctantly expended, chiefly in stores encumbered with perfunctory and sometimes useless doctors and champagne-bibbing agents.

The public may judge of the probable future course of the National Society by its past history, especially in the Franco-German War, and I therefore append my experience of it, and the strictures which I published at the time in the *Times* and other

newspapers, with my name attached, and which they did not even attempt to refute. Observing that only about half a dozen members of both Houses of Parliament had gone, either from curiosity or philanthropy, to the seat of war, I went up to London and saw the committee, who, morally, threw buckets of cold water on my zeal in what I considered a sacred cause. Colonel Lindsay, though I am his superior both in rank and age, treated me with the utmost hauteur, and strongly advised me to return home at once, as he did not want my services, and, in fact, would much rather be without them. I in vain informed him that I spoke French almost as readily and with as good an accent as English, that I could make myself understood in German, that I had robust health and strength, that I was persevering, active, not altogether devoid of intelligence, and anxious to be of use; and that as I was a baronet, the owner of the most extensive property in my own county, and its parliamentary representative, my zealous and disinterested services would be more welcome both to the French and Germans than those of probably any of their paid agents. All was to no purpose, but finding that I was not to be put off by any amount of discouragement, he gave me a document, which I found of very little use, and I started. The sequel will appear from the letters I now subjoin.

Colonel Loyd-Lindsay's reply, in the *Times* of August 21st, to the memorial presented by our deputation, and which, I suppose in accordance with a rule of a society (which excluded the press during that interview) is undated, quotes the letter which the National Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded had received from the Government of St. Petersburg, which clearly shows that there is no foundation whatever for the indifference which, he alleged, existed on the part of the Russians to receive aid from the society.

M. Giers says, "The staff of our ambulances is complete, and permits us to give help, not only to our wounded, but to those of the enemy who may fall into our hands. Nevertheless, the Imperial Government would accept, *with gratitude*, every help in kind which the said society may be good enough to send us."

This sentence certainly does not bear out what Colonel Lindsay said at the meeting as to the coldness and indifference as to aid of which he accused the Russians, but flatly contradicts it.

Colonel Lindsay then says, "If, for instance, the proffered aid of surgeons is declined by the Russian Government, on the ground that they are amply provided by their own resources in that respect, and that they do not wish for foreign aid, this does not, in the opinion of the council, constitute a ground for withdrawing surgical aid from Turkish sufferers, lest, under a mistaken view of the subject, the principle of strict impartiality should be said to have been violated. . . There is no suggestion in the memorial that any actual need has been left unsatisfied, either in Russia or in Montenegro, nor are they (the council) aware that any mention has been made of such requirements by correspondents writing home to English newspapers from the seat of war in Bulgaria and Montenegro."

All I can say is, that if the council find no evidence of there being any need in the letters of correspondents in the newspapers, it must be that either they only read the *Daily Telegraph*, or that they keep the eye with which they look on the Russian side shut, whilst that which is brought to bear on the Turkish side is wide open, and that none are so blind as those who won't see.

Nobody suggested, as Colonel Lindsay insinuates, "the withdrawing of surgical aid from Turkish sufferers." What we say is, give a precisely equal amount, "in meal or in malt," as the saying is, to the Russians and Montenegrins as to the Turks, as the society did in the Franco-German war, within a minute fraction, as was shown by the deputation; but then supposed British interests and British prejudices were not so decidedly involved.

Colonel Lindsay's argument amounts to this—because the Turks have provided hardly any surgeons or stores for the wounded, in order by this disgraceful inhumanity to their own soldiers to put more troops into the field, whilst the Russians have, regardless of expense, provided (*what was before the battle of Plevna, but perhaps is now no longer*) an ample surgical staff, but is deficient in stores, of which they could not foresee the amount required,

therefore the society will give a premium on the barbarous neglect of their wounded by the Turks, and will furnish them with both surgeons and stores; whilst as the Russians, with a proper sense of national dignity and a dislike of needless waste, do not want our surgeons, therefore they shall not even have an equal amount of stores to that which we gave the Turks, and must take their chance of such stores as the Turks should insist on forwarding to the Russians through their lines from the Black Sea, or of such as the National Society's ship may at some future time determine to convey up the Danube, with almost the certainty of being blown up by a torpedo. The insulting condition with which assistance to the Russians is clogged, that a surgeon or other agent of the society should distribute the stores, which was not rigorously imposed on the Germans, is simply a device on the part of a Turkomaniac committee to avoid the obligation incumbent on them of giving an equal share of their funds to the Russians, and it is as much as to say to the Russians, "You are such blackguards that if we gave you the stores you would sell them, steal them, or misuse them."

It is evident that a wounded Russian soldier would rather have a surgical operation performed, or a sick soldier would rather have his malady prescribed for, by a Russian doctor, to whom he could explain his wants, his symptoms, his sensations, and his ailments, and who could converse with him, than by an English surgeon, with whom he could hold no more intercourse than with a Chinaman; and in the Franco-German war the two surgeons sent by the National Society (with me) were not allowed, either by the Germans or the French, to operate, and refused to attend the sick, so that all their expenses were as much wasted as money thrown into the sea. The Russians, if they were not so honourable, might nominally accept our surgeons to distribute our stores, and if they did it would be impossible for them to insist on operating, or to prevent the misappropriation of the stores if, which is not the case, the Russians wished to misapply them.

If the Russian claim for aid cannot be otherwise got rid of, I would suggest that the National Society should impose the con-

dition that the parties receiving relief should go down on their knees before their agent, in which case doubtless the Turks, who are accustomed to do this to their Sultan, would probably agree, whilst the Russians would be certain indignantly to decline.

At the meeting Colonel Lindsay stated that the announcement I made that the Empress of Russia had caused a letter to be written to Mr. Lewis Farley, saying that the Russians would "*gratefully accept*" aid, threw an entirely new and unexpected light on the subject; and on sending him the letter, he wrote to me that he had perused it with *great interest;* but no mention is made of this important communication in Colonel Lindsay's long-winded reply in the *Times.*

As the Turks mutilate and murder the Russian wounded, whilst the Russians, instead of retaliating, treat the Turkish wounded like their own, it is quite clear that even if the National Society gave an equal sum to the Russians and Montenegrins as to the Turks, the former would still not have their fair share, since the amount expended by the Russians on the Turkish wounded would not be balanced by a similar amount spent by the Turks on the Russian wounded, whom they not only murder and mutilate, but rob. The *Popolo Romano,* as appears by the *Daily News,* has published a letter from its correspondent at Bucharest, in which he says, in conclusion, "the truth is, the Russians behave like civilized people, the Turks like savages."

FROM THE "TIMES."

Lady Sinclair, of Thurso Castle, has kindly favoured us with the following graphic letter, which her ladyship has received from Sir Tollemache, who lately paid a visit to the scene of war operations near Sedan:—

Ambulance Anglo-Americaine,
Sedan, Sept. 13, 1870.

I wrote you a long letter from Arlon, which I trust you duly received, and I telegraphed to you to-day from here to say that

I am safe and well, that I see my way to do some good here, and that for the present I intend to remain at Sedan; but as I was only one night at Luxembourg, and another at Arlon, I have not yet received any letters from home, for you could not have written in time. As I mentioned in my letter from Arlon, I devoted some hours of the day which I spent there to classify the stores of the English Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded in War in a book, so that the agents of the Society might know how much of each article they possessed, but I found that everything was in the greatest confusion, and that the contents of many bales and cases were unknown. However, I at last succeeded, as I thought, in making an inventory, and I proposed next day to classify the stores, by placing all articles of the same kind together, instead of leaving them in a confused heap; but, as they preferred their own plan, I left them to their own devices. On the preceding day two waggons were sent off from Arlon, with two surgeons and two dressers (on foot) to Beaumont—a distance of about thirty miles—on one of the wettest days I have ever seen, although carriages could be had on hire in the town; but I saw clearly that the waggons were only half-loaded, and I afterwards found that the articles had been badly selected, and on the third day the doctors had hardly anything to eat and were glad of some assistance from the stores of our party. The two doctors, whom I accompanied, very properly refused unnecessarily to trudge thirty miles to Stenay, and, although the agent could not find any carriage for them, they themselves found an omnibus and pair, which he at first declined to hire for them, but at last he yielded the point, and we made arrangements for our departure. I was anxious that we should have a good assortment of everything likely to be useful, and especially drugs, and that the waggons should be sufficiently loaded; but I could only secure a very few drugs, and when everything that they were inclined to give us, out of the many tons of stores, had been put on, I saw that the waggons were not even half full. The agent and the store-keeper, however, maintained that the waggons could not carry

more, and that the carters' estimate of about two tons per waggon was about right. I felt certain that they were wrong, and asked them to weigh one waggonload, but was told that they had no scales and weights, and that none could be got in the town. However, I found both at the hotel at which the head-quarters of the Society are established, and on weighing the first waggon the load turned out to be 915 kilogrammes, instead of 2,000. However, they refused to put any more on, and the other waggon had a still lighter weight, so that the two together had not sufficient for one, whilst each waggon cost the Society 100 francs for going and returning.

We started in the afternoon, and reached Virton that night, where we found many French refugees, and, amongst others, a sub-lieutenant, who had been taken prisoner at Sedan, and who had escaped. In the course of the evening a Municipal Councillor from Montmedy, which still holds out for the French, came in, and asked us to give him drugs, as they were in great want of medicine; but finding they had enough in the meantime, we refused, and gave them the address of a doctor in Brussels, who would send them whatever they wanted—a plan which, simple and obvious as it is, had never occurred to the doctors and druggists of Montmedy.

Next morning we started early, and reached Montmedy (which is strongly fortified and somewhat picturesque) about ten a.m., when we were at once taken under the charge of a gendarme, and conducted to the French Governor of the fort. The Germans had bombarded the place a few days previously, but were unable to take it; and though their bombs destroyed some houses in the upper town adjoining the citadel, the lower town was wholly uninjured

The Governor at first eyed us with some suspicion; but on observing by my passport that I was a member of Parliament, he said I might have a pass, and asked me if I would take charge of a Luxembourg ambulance which had arrived at Montmedy the day before, but which he suspected was a commercial venture in stores, for the benefit of the Germans. We were

then taken to the office, and the clerk asked me to draw up the pass in my own words, which I did, and it was then duly signed and stamped; but just at that moment a French captain of artillery came in, and intimated more plainly than politely that he believed our stores were for the Prussians, and that not improbably we were spies, who ought to be shot, or, at any rate, thrown into prison. I showed him my passport, and he then was convinced that he was mistaken as to us, but spoke very roughly to the Luxembourgeois, and told them distinctly that he would prevent them from proceeding to Stenay, and immediately afterwards they were deprived of their stores and sent back. He then expressed himself bitterly against the English, who, he said, all sympathised with the Prussians, although I had told him that upwards of two millions of francs had been subscribed in England to aid the French and German wounded indiscriminately, or far more than the French had subscribed for their own wounded.

On walking down to the lower town we inspected the hospital, which was tolerably comfortable, and then ordered our horses to be put to in order to continue our journey; but the drivers refused to go, and added that they had been threatened so much by the people that they were afraid to proceed. With much trouble we succeeded in getting them to agree to proceed; but a mob collected, who told us that they would prevent us from going to Stenay, although I showed them the pass signed and sealed. We, however, ordered them to drive on, when some men rushed forward and seized the horses by the bridles. I then took the bridles from them, and led the waggons forward. After going a few yards another knot of people stopped us, and then another, and, at last, with difficulty, we reached the top of the hill; but here a large collection of people met us, and absolutely refused to let us proceed, and I had to go in search of a lieutenant, who was most polite, and at last enabled us to descend the hill. So much for the state of discipline in Montmedy.

We baited half-way, at a small village, and I took the oppor-

tunity of talking to a number of the people, and found that they no longer feared the Germans, and that only one man out of the entire population had volunteered for the army, and he had only gone because he had quarrelled with his wife! I saw clearly that none of them were ambitious of fighting the Prussians, and that they did not care a straw whether France lost Alsace or not. In fact, the rural population of France is sick of war-glory and bloodshed. They have no arms, and few of them know how to use a gun; indeed, there were only about six fowling pieces in the village and neighbourhood, and these the Prussians have taken. I asked them whether, if the Prussians were defeated and flying past their doors, pursued by the French, they would stop them, kill them, or injure them? But they all assured me that they would not molest them in any way, but would rather show them any kindness in their power. If, as I believe, this is a fair specimen of the temper of the people of France, it is clear that all the tall-talking of the French newspapers about *levees en masse*, about francs tireurs, and exterminating the German travellers, is buncombe. Because the Spaniards half a century ago formed guerilla bands, and massacred as many French soldiers as possible, therefore it is urged the French peasantry could and should become francs tireurs, and destroy as many Germans as they can. In those days, however, the peasantry were treated with the grossest cruelty; women were dishonoured, and the population reduced to ruin, starvation, and despair; whereas now the invading army treats the peasantry at least as well, and, in some cases, better than their own troops. They feel that their rulers are to blame for an aggressive and unprovoked war; and they see clearly that, whether victorious or beaten, they will get but little thanks for the dangers and sufferings which they are invited to encounter in a war begun because the King of Prussia refused to see Benedetti.

In a few hours we reached Stenay, a town of nearly 3,000 inhabitants, and there we put ourselves in communication with the French and Prussian medical men, and found that they had hardly any drugs, and that there was a deficiency of almost every-

thing required by the sick and wounded. Though Captain Brackenbury, the agent for the Society, had forbidden us to give away any of our drugs, I felt myself compelled by the urgent necessity of the case to disregard his instructions, and I distributed nearly the whole equally between the French and Germans, who were most grateful and obliging. We dined with the principal surgeon of Stenay, and met a number of French and German surgeons, who were most civil and agreeable; but before dinner was over one of them mentioned that from 2,000 to 3,000 French prisoners from Sedan were expected at Stenay that night, and that he was afraid that they would not obtain even bread to eat. I said that I thought it a disgrace to the people of Stenay utterly to neglect the French prisoners, and that I could not sit still and drink champagne and claret and hear that the prisoners had no bread and the wounded no wine. They told me that little or no bread could be had in Stenay; but fortunately we had brought 700 pounds of bread from Belgium, and I resolved to distribute this at my own expense, and refund the price to the Society, as their funds are only applicable to the sick and wounded. Only one or two of the doctors accompanied me, and I had the greatest difficulty in obtaining a few volunteers out of the numerous idlers in the streets, to carry my bread to the prisoners. On entering the church I saw the poor soldiers, pale and emaciated, and worn out with fatigue and hunger, not having had anything to eat for more than twenty-four hours, but overjoyed to hear that an Englishman had bread at least to give them, although their own countrymen utterly neglected them. When I produced the bread there was a general rush towards me, and it required two Prussian soldiers, with fixed bayonets, to keep them from crushing me to death as I passed through them; whilst on all sides they besought me, for the love of God, to give them a morsel, however small. I at last completed the distribution with my own hands, and my store provided one-third of a pound for each man, for which the poor fellows were most grateful; and I am glad to say that they all behaved extremely well, and that the strong and healthy who

contrived to secure the loaves divided them fairly with the weak and sickly.

About 70,000 prisoners out of 100,000 taken at Sedan passed through Stenay, staying each one night; and if the people of that town had been philanthropic they would have been able, for 1,750 francs, or £70, to give a pound of bread to each soldier, which they could have obtained, as I did, by sending carts to Belgium or putting themselves on half rations. No doubt the Germans were bound to feed their prisoners; but if they could and would not do this, the French should and could have done it, and, as a precautionary measure, they should at least have provided a pound of bread a man, even although they believed that the Germans would provide the usual minimum and insufficient ration which prisoners receive. How different is the way in which the Germans treat the sick and wounded and the French prisoners in their own country! When the trains arrive ladies and gentlemen of the highest rank vie with each other in munificent provision for their wants, distributing not only bread, which is not needed, but cigars, wine, fruit, and delicacies of every kind, in profuse abundance; in short, the French are infinitely better treated by their enemies than by their countrymen.

Next morning it distressed me to see many of the prisoners limping along without shoes and with sore and bleeding feet, but none of the wealthier class in Stenay were there, as far as I could see, to say even a kind word to any of them; and though I would gladly have taken the boots off my own feet, it was impossible to delay the march, and not one of the people of Stenay had provided a carriage or even a cart for those who were compelled, though quite unable, to march a second twenty miles without breakfast and without money to buy the food which some of their more fortunate companions had eagerly purchased from their grasping fellow-countrymen at usurious prices. A German Protestant pastor gave me a seat in his carriage to Sedan, and my companions followed slowly at a walk by another road which passes through Beaumont, and where

they found even more than the usual dearth of provisions and medicines. After passing through several small villages, where I distributed chloroform, Liebig's extract of meat, and other things of which there were an utter destitution, we reached Mouzon, where there is a beautiful church, which, before the war, was being restored. I went to the German and French ambulances, and found that they also stood in want of medicine, and of almost everything else, and I therefore gave what I could out of the Society's stores, but not nearly as much as they wanted, or as I would have wished. Amongst other requirements the doctors and nurses at the French hospital told me that they wanted wine, which they said could not be bought in or near Mouzon. Upon this I went to the principal hotel, when they told me that they could sell me 100 bottles of Burgundy and fifty of claret, the latter at fifteen pence per bottle; but on mentioning this to the doctors they said it was far too dear, and as no cheaper wine could be got, the sick and wounded must do without, unless I could supply them. I told them that I considered such parsimony cruel and foolish, for, setting aside humanity, a soldier was supposed to be worth at least one hundred pounds in peace and more in time of war, and that it was sound economy to save their lives by giving tolerable wine to their patients, as, after all, it was cheaper than medicine, and one-third of the quantity of claret at fifteen pence a bottle would do as much or more good as a full ration of the wretched vin ordinaire at five pence. As argument and entreaty were useless, I bought six bottles of good claret and served it round myself to all the patients, saying it was a present from the English Society for the Relief of the Wounded, and they were all very thankful, even for this small attention.

The commanding officer of the German Volunteer Depôt for the wounded gave me a chassepot rifle and sword-bayonet, which I accepted, and offered me a sabre and helmet, of which I did not like to deprive him, and we then proceeded to Douzy, where there are many sick and wounded, and from thence to Bazielles, a large village, every house of which was totally destroyed by

the German artillery buring the battle of Sedan. It is a fearful and extraordinary sight, and I trust I may never again witness such a wreck.

A short distance further, after looking at the field of battle, still strewed with dead horses, which poisoned the air with an insufferable stench, we reached Sedan, which is a large town of about 150,000 inhabitants, with what was formerly considered most formidable fortifications, and to add to their strength the river had been dammed up, and a large extent of country was flooded. As there was no room at any hotel I gladly accepted the proffered hospitality of the surgeons of the Anglo-American Ambulance; and I am now writing this letter in the room where I am to sleep with the two principal surgeons, who are now fast asleep, it being nearly one in the morning. The hospital here accommodates about 500 patients, being far more, I understand, than any other of the ambulances here, and every bed is occupied, while a considerable number occupy tents outside. The doctors seem most attentive, and I believe they have been unusually successful, and all comforts are liberally provided, whilst the medical men themselves are content with a diet which is even too Spartan for me, though I am easily satisfied. Seven Frenchmen, however, died yesterday, some of them, I believe, in consequence of having been prematurely removed from the German hospital to make room for Prussians, which is a fatal mistake, as the French would have had a far better chance if they had not been moved, and the Germans might have been sent here, where they would have been better off than in their own hospital.

We breakfasted about seven o'clock this morning, and I afterwards went with a party to Donchery, three miles from here, where the railway is open to Belgium, and there I found about 200 French wounded prisoners, who were to be sent off by train, many of them on stretchers, having legs or arms amputated, and I should have thought utterly unfit for the journey, and some of them nearly certain to die on the road. The poor fellows were lying on straw on waggons, or sitting in third-class carriages,

and they told me that they had received no food that day except some biscuits, which they saw in a box, and to which they helped themselves. They said, moreover, that ever since the campaign began they never had a sufficiency of food, and had received wine only three times in three weeks. An itinerant vendor of chocolate having left his box open for a few minutes, a few of the wounded soldiers helped themselves, but were soon detected by the owner, who abused them in no measured terms. Finding that the wounded preferred chocolate to anything else, I bought enough for the whole of the men, and then one of the ladies gave them apples, and we then supplied them all with water to drink, and filled bottles for them in case they were thirsty on the journey; but no one but ourselves paid them the slightest attention, and one of their own officers looked tranquilly on, but gave us no assistance, though some of the wounded were officers. Nothing could exceed the gratitude of the poor men for our trifling attentions, and we drove off amidst cries of "Vive l'Angleterre!"

On my return to Sedan we saw that the camp of the French prisoners was deserted, but I learned to my horror that they were half starved, and had little else but horseflesh to live on, and not enough of that, though Sedan is a rich manufacturing town, close to the camp, and feeding them all when here with bread would only have cost about £900. After a rather unsatisfactory luncheon of dry bread and wine, I drove to see Dr. Frank, whom you recollect at Cannes, and who seems to be most active and useful, for those of his patients whom I addressed speak warmly of his kind and skilful treatment.

On my return I determined to visit every hospital and every private house where there were any wounded men, and, besides endeavouring to supply any pressing wants, to offer to transmit letters and telegrams through Belgium to their relatives, and to forward replies by the same channel, and I was delighted to find that many gladly availed themselves of my offer, including several officers, who for three weeks have never been able to communicate with their friends, as the plan which I have

adopted, though easy and inexpensive, had never occurred to them. One unfortunate officer who, I fear, cannot survive, told me that he had been robbed of all his money when lying wounded on the field of battle by a French soldier!

It appears to me that the management of the affairs of the English Society for the Relief of the Sick and Wounded is most unsatisfactory, and, as a French surgeon said to me to-day, before we distribute half of our stores and money the wounded will probably be dead or cured, and the war will be ended; and I have telegraphed to this effect to the Society in London, with the concurrence of the two English doctors who accompanied me to Sedan. It is quite a mistake to suppose that the peasantry are starving, and that the necessaries of life are enormously dear. Bread sells at five pence the kilogramme, which is more than two English pounds, and on inquiry at Balan to-day I found that meat was 1*s.* 3*d.* per kilogramme, whilst butter is two francs per French pound, and Bordeaux, in cask, 1 franc 25 centimes per litre, which is about one-fourth more than the contents of a bottle.

It is now past two o'clock, so I must conclude abruptly.

Yours, &c.,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

REFUSED BY THE "TIMES."

The following letter, from Sir J. G. T. Sinclair, Bart, M.P., appears in the *Morning Advertiser*:—

SIR,—Having returned home to-day from the seat of war, after an abser of three weeks, I consider it an imperative though irksome duty to bring before the public, through your columns, the gross mismanagement of the London Committee and the foreign agents of the National Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded in War.

As far as I can judge, the proceedings both of the London Committee and of their agents on the Continent have been a strange, and, to an Englishman, humiliating combination of parsimony

and extravagance, recklessness and timidity, dilatoriness and hurry; the whole combined with an utter want of method, and an entire absence of any intelligible guiding principles of action; and, by their own confession, they have not forwarded from London more than about one-fourth of the amount of the subscriptions, of which the greater part has not yet been locally expended, though the war is practically nearly over, and all the great battles have already been fought.

The society was originally formed in July, and a meeting was held in London, when a sort of Provisional Government was formed, much in the same haphazard way as the present political Government of Paris, without, as I think, proper consideration as to the qualifications of the individuals to whom the serious, responsible, and difficult task of directing this important national object was to be entrusted; and thus duties of vital consequence to the sick and wounded at the seat of war, and to the honour of the English name for philanthropy and liberality, fell into the hands of a few wealthy and inexperienced amateurs, instead of into those of officials and men of business like Sir Charles Trevelyan and others, who would have inspired confidence in the nation, and thus have stimulated subscriptions, and who would have made half the money go further than the present administration with the entire funds.

Any one of the smallest discernment and the most slender faith in the benevolence of his fellow-countrymen must have foreseen, by previous examples of the unbounded generosity of the British public, that the subscriptions for the sick and wounded could not and ought not to be below £100,000, and it is already nearly £200,000; and if the London Committee had been equal to the occasion, they should have immediately begun operations on a scale commensurate with such a fund, and if individuals of such well-known wealth were afraid to incur such a pecuniary responsibility, a guarantee fund of that amount could have been raised in London within twenty-four hours. Instead of this the committee proceeded slowly, timidly, and parsimoniously, with only faith like a grain of mustard seed in British philanthropy,

and the critical days after the battles of Woerth, Weissenburg, Spicheren, Gravelotte, Mars-la-Tours, Rezonville, and Sedan were allowed to slip away without anything effectual having been done. And now when the worst is over, when the wounded are dead or have been sent away, the surgeons, agents, and wagons of the society, loaded with superfluous stores, come out at last, too late, lumbering slowly into the seat of war.

The first agents selected by the society, as might have been anticipated, did not give satisfaction, and were consequently superseded by Captain Brackenbury, who, in the letter published from him in the *Times*, condemns their management in strong terms; but he does not allude to one of their proceedings which he mentioned to me—namely, that they bought £700 worth of carriages, horses, and harness, which have gone off, as I understood, empty in the rear of the Prussian army of Paris, and which I have little doubt have been used for other purposes than those contemplated by the National Society, if they have not been confiscated by the franc-tireurs, who are as formidable to the peaceful civilians as they are comparatively innoxious to the Germans.

My first intercourse with the London Committee was in the shape of letters which I wrote, enclosing a subscription to the funds, and suggesting that if lint could not be obtained in sufficient quantities, it might be made to almost any amount out of cleansed and selected rags from the paper manufacturers, and that as the greater number of the wounded (both German and French) were in the hands of the Prussians, the funds of the society should not be divided equally among the armies of both nations, but given rateably to the proportion of wounded. To these and other suggestions I received no other reply than a short acknowledgment of my subscription.

Being impressed with the distressing conviction derived from the letters in the *Times*, *Telegraph*, and other papers, that the whole management of the National Society was defective, and that their staff was insufficient, I proceeded to London, and offered to place my services at the disposal of the committee (if

they would give me a definite and independent mission), who, however, told me that they did not see what I could do, as they had more representatives already than they knew what to do with. In reply, I said that it was impossible that any Englishman going out at his own sole expense, with the desire to do good, could fail to find some means of usefulness, and that I was determined to go. They then offered me one of the very few parchment commissions, of which, as I understood, they had then granted but three, accrediting me as one of their agents. But preferring independence of action, and disapproving of the terms of the document, I declined it.

I then proceeded to Arlon, and offered my services to Captain Brackenbury, who also was utterly unable to point out any shape in which I could assist the society; but at last, in the mode pointed out in my letter, which is published in the *Times* of Thursday last, I myself had no difficulty in discovering various ways in which I could have been of great use at Arlon if I had not been prevented by Captain Brackenbury; and on my journey to Stenay, Mouzon, and Sedan, I had the inexpressible gratification of being able to render important services to the sick and wounded, but only by disobeying his positive instructions, and giving drugs and other stores to the various ambulances, though they did not require the services of the surgeons who accompanied me. I believe I was the means of saving the lives of a large portion of 2,400 French prisoners at Stenay, by appropriating and purchasing most of the bread which was sent with me for the wounded, and which the latter did not require, except a few of those at Pouilly; but of course this was a trifle hardly worth the consideration of the National Society and its agents, though I myself would have travelled from the utmost extremity of the earth to have the inestimable privilege of being able, especially at an utterly insignificant pecuniary sacrifice, to render such a service.

Further, at nearly all the ambulances and hospitals which I visited there was either a total deficiency or a wholly inadequate supply of everything beyond the barest necessaries; and the

nursing of the sick, when not performed by sisters of charity, was entrusted to professional *infirmiers*, who usually discharged their duty in the most perfunctory and unsatisfactory manner, and whose average numbers are only one to ten wounded men, which is obviously wholly insufficient. At the various ambulances the medical men are so overworked that they have not time to attend to any other than strictly professional duties, and even the officers complain that their diet consisted merely of *bouillon*, which, as many of your readers know, is only another name for tepid water, with a little grease floating on the top, into which a little beef has been boiled for a few minutes, and *bouilli*, which is the said morsel of meat with the food extracted, and a handful of dry and usually acid bread. And there was abundant occupation in seeing that a more nourishing and palatable diet is added by giving Liebig's extract, preserved meat, chocolate, coffee, jelly, biscuits, good wine, and cigars to the sick and wounded; also in writing and sending letters and telegrams to their relatives, and, in the case of the dying, to endeavour to prepare them for the solemn event—a task which is carelessly and indifferently performed at present by a few ungenial priests—in showing sympathy with their bodily and mental distress in conveying their last dying messages to friends and relatives, and in trying, however feebly, to soothe their last moments. These, however, are services which are best discharged by some of those benevolent ladies with whom Britain abounds, as it is difficult for men to establish that immediate and complete feeling of implicit confidence which in such moments the more sympathetic nature and greater tact and self-devotion of women so easily inspire. In fact, most of the wounded seem to die altogether unwarned of their approaching end, and one of them could get no other book to read than a dry pamphlet on the Propaganda.

Such services are chiefly, if not solely, needed by the French officers and soldiers, who, in Sedan and elsewhere, are most shamefully neglected by their fellow-countrymen and country-women, and who are utterly helpless when they are in a diffi-

culty, even if they have plenty of money. I visited a considerable number of French officers, many of them suffering from agonising wounds, lying on short, narrow, iron bedsteads, with a straw and a wool mattress, and a hard, cylindrical pillow, which catches the extreme back of the head and shoulders, and leaves a considerable strain on the muscles of the neck; and finding that I, though well and fatigued, could not sleep a wink under such circumstances, I wondered much that none of the rich inhabitants of Sedan had been willing to give up, even for a single night, one of their soft, roomy beds, spring mattresses, and large downy pillows, for any of their wounded officers. In fact, the selfish and cynical indifference of the French to the wounded and these who were prisoners was to me astounding and appalling. I called at one of the largest mansions in Sedan and saw the proprietor and his wife, who asked me if I could obtain any intelligence of a French colonel of hussars, who was lying wounded at Beaumont, and in whose welfare the husband professed a strong interest. I replied that if he really cared for his wounded friend he should take his comfortable carriage after breakfast and bring him home to dinner, instead of giving others the trouble who were fully employed; and I proceeded to dilate in the strongest terms on the conduct of the people of Sedan and elsewhere to the French wounded and prisoners, as I also did afterwards at greater length to a large party of French surgeons and others at the French Ambulance at the Solus-Prefecture, with the almost entire assent of my audience.

On the morning preceding my departure from Sedan I was surprised and pained to learn that a considerable number of wounded were being removed, or, as the phrase goes, *évacué*, from the Anglo-American Ambulance, though in the opinion of our surgeons many were unfit to travel; and it would have been better and kinder to have placed a pistol at their heads and to have shot them on the spot. It was most distressing to hear the cries of the poor men as they were jolted in wagons without springs, and with but little straw, over rough roads.

The same evening orders were received that forty out of the

sixty-seven *infirmiers*, or hospital attendants, should leave our ambulance, at which our doctors were naturally most justly irate, and loud were the denunciations of the inhumanity of the Germans.

I proceeded next morning to the Commandant, who received me most politely, and told him that as my sympathies were with the German cause, I was distressed to see and hear his countrymen accused of ordering wounded men to be removed who were incapable of the journey, and of recklessly depriving the Anglo-American Ambulance, at an hour's notice, of two-thirds of the hospital attendants, when there were already too few; and as one of the chief surgeons of the German army who accompanied me round the wards remarked, there was a deficiency of cleanliness, caused by an insufficient and inefficient staff of servants. The Commandant said in reply that the Chief of the French Intendance had called to inform him that many of the wounded in the various ambulances, and, amongst others, in ours, could and should be removed; and not supposing that he would be guilty of carelessness or inhumanity to his own countrymen at any rate, he gave the necessary orders, but was shocked and grieved to hear my statement, and would inquire immediately into the circumstances. He added that on the preceding day the French Intendance had complained of the excessive number of *infirmiers* in our ambulance, and said that twenty-seven, instead of forty-seven, were amply sufficient, upon which (again believing his representation, and knowing that nineteen-twentieths of our wounded were French) he permitted forty to be removed. The Commandant seemed hurt that I could have believed it possible that he could be intentionally guilty of such inhumanity, of which no German officer, he said, would be capable; and he went on to say that, while we English spoke of our neutrality, it seemed odd that nearly all our wounded were French, and that none of the stores of our National Society, as far as he knew, had been sent to the Germans, whilst he saw wagon-loads outside our ambulance at half-past four that morning. I told him that the proportion of French was, I felt sure, acci-

dental; that the French surgeons were, I understood, less skilful and attentive than the German surgeons, and less provided with medical necessaries and comforts; that our stores had only arrived the preceding evening, and that I would do all in my power to obtain a large supply for the Germans from our now superabundant stores; but the Germans are too proud to ask, and at the time we had no one authorized to ascertain what they required, and to proffer such gifts as we could spare.

I also took the opportunity of seeing other German officers of rank, to ask whether it was true that the 100,000 French prisoners were half-starved by them at Sedan. They told me that on the day of the capitulation, and for a day or two after, no bread was baked, and there was a deficiency of everything; but they gave as much food as they could spare to the prisoners, and their own men were upon little more than half rations at the time. It was obviously impossible for the Germans to anticipate and provide against the capture of 100,000 prisoners, and it is wonderful indeed that things were not much worse. In fact, if the French had taken the German army as prisoners of war, they would not only have had nothing for them, but must have fed themselves chiefly from German stores. Some officers told me that the German authorities ordered the people of Sedan to supply the prisoners, and they could easily have done this from Belgium—a distance of about twenty miles—by borrowing money on the security of the town; and, in any case, even if the Germans were bound to find the barest necessaries of life, the French might have taxed their private and municipal resources to provide something more than dry bread in addition to the German rations, or in lieu of them; and this, as I have shown in my last letter, would only have cost about £900 to £1,000; and even had they done this, it would have been far inferior to the profuse liberality of the Germans in their own country, not only to their compatriots, but to the French prisoners.

The night before I started from Sedan I dined at the Hotel d'Europe with an English acquaintance of the Jewish persuasion, with whom I had much satisfaction in co-operating in

various plans for the benefit of the wounded. At dinner we met with the agents of the Brussels Society for the Wounded, who had at last arrived to secure a sufficient number of wounded to fill 1,200 beds which had been granted at Brussels, as well as thousands more in other parts of Belgium; but up to that day (the 14th) they had obtained hardly any, though hundreds had been sent off by railway without any attempt on their part to secure them; and even now, I believe, only a small portion of the beds are occupied, so that, by a fatal coincidence, the same mismanagement which characterizes our English National Society is chargeable, though in a less degree, against the Belgians; whilst the Dutch ambulances are admirably managed, and leave scarcely anything to be desired.—I am, sir, yours, &c.,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

Thurso Castle, Sept. 24, 1870.

A letter in the *Cologne Gazette* suggests that the balloons now so much in vogue should be utilized so as to dispose the French people towards peace. It says:—"Now that Paris is completely invested, the employment of balloons for the purpose of dispersing over Paris proclamations or other necessary information—particularly accurate information as to the position of affairs and the whole course of events since the declaration of the war—is resorted to. It would be desirable if members of the Geneva Convention and of the international societies for the relief of the wounded would by means of such communications disseminate information which would weaken, if not remove, the blind prejudices of the French population. The statements of well-accredited correspondents, such as the Duke of Manchester, Sir Tollemache Sinclair, and others, would also have a beneficial effect on the people if made known in this war."

The *Times* publishes the following extracts from a letter of Sir J. G. T. Sinclair:—

"At the time of my visit the streets of Sedan and the cafés

were full of men, chiefly attached to the French ambulances, who appeared to have nothing to do but enjoy themselves; and the commissariat clerk of one of these, which, he informed me (and as I fully believe from his business-like proceeding and candour) was doing great service in a neighbouring village, told me that half the French ambulances were partially or entirely idle, and that some of them had left Paris without either instruments or drugs, and were still without either.

"On paying a visit to the hospital on the evening before my departure I remained till past nine, and, as the town was in a state of siege, the drawbridge was lifted, and the sentry told me that I must remain; but on finding the guard the sergeant most good-naturedly brought down six men, who lifted the heavy bridge with difficulty, and let me return to my hotel, refusing any remuneration for their services.

"Next morning we started from Sedan for Libramont in my friend's carriage, with two wounded French officers, and on arriving at Givonne, visited the Duc de B——, a French officer, who was severely wounded, and is now nursed by his mother; and it seemed to me strange that other French ladies did not follow her example, as the Germans make no difficulties, but are most civil and obliging, and my passport was never once asked for by them. The Duc and five other French officers were under the care of German doctors, and were loud in praise of their attention and skill; but here again there was a great want of everything beyond the bare necessaries of life, and a scarcity of drugs. In fact, at the very moment that I arrived a poor soldier was suffering severely from tetanus, and there was no hydrate of chlorate to give him; but fortunately I had a bottle of this, along with other medicines, from my good-natured friends of the Anglo-American ambulance, which I gave, and which was gratefully accepted. My friend offered to take one of the wounded officers at Givonne to his house in Brussels, where he intends keeping a number of wounded officers at his sole expense till they are well, and one of them gladly accepted the invitation. He told

me that the officers of the French Intendance were *des canailles*, and that one of them wanted to 'evacuate' him; but he ordered him off in double quick time, and told him that he was a *cochon*. He added that some of the gentlemen attached to a French ambulance, consisting of the Duc de F—— and other Parisian exquisites, called on them, and asked if they wanted anything; but though they required everything but necessaries they were too proud to ask, upon which a few cigars only were given to each. Before they left one officer said he wished he could buy a paletot, upon which these gentlemen told him that he might have as many as he pleased, as money was no object, and they had abundance of stores; but the paletot never arrived, and the fact is, a large proportion of those who accompany French ambulances are *fainéant*, who like the honour and *éclat* of playing at philanthropy at the smallest possible cost.

"At Libramont I parted with my friends and went to Luxembourg, where I found that the correspondents of various newspapers, whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making on my last visit there, had gone to the neighbourhood of Metz, and I therefore started next morning—stayed for a few hours at Treves, where I saw some handsome churches, the beautiful Roman gateway, and other objects of great interest; met Comte Palikao's daughter, who could not obtain any tidings of her father, or of her brother and cousin, and whom I could not assist in her search, and reached Saarbruck that night. At Saarbruck I found your correspondent, and I put myself also in communication with a medical gentleman, sent by the National

on, of, I believe, considerable reputation in
received me most cordially, and was most
nself useful, but who had received no precise
d nothing whatever to do.
iours, instead of two, in going to Remilly,
, wine, brandy, and other articles were being
rices, and where I saw that the Germans had
geese and poultry of the French—not even
ng an egg. Captain Maclaine kindly placed

his carriage and pair at the disposal of myself and three other English gentlemen, and we started on a fine afternoon for the last outpost of the Prussian army at Merci-le-Haut, within twenty-five minutes' walk of Metz. When we reached the last post but one it appears that our coachman was ordered to stop, but neither he nor any of us at first heard the challenge, but on its being reiterated I stopped the carriage, when we were roundly scolded for disobeying orders, and told that if the sentries had done their duty they would have shot us. Our pass was only for two, and we were four, so that at first I was told that I could not proceed, but by means of a little civility we soon gained on the invariable good nature of the Germans, and they allowed us to go on.

"On arriving at the last outpost the officers kindly sent a sentry with us, as we were within shot both of the cannon from the town and the French sentinels, and we dodged down as near as we could, and stood behind trees within less than half the range of a chassepot, which we saw in the hands of a French sentry, who, however, did not attempt to molest us. We saw men, houses, tents, &c., outside Metz, within the French lines, and heard the band playing in the town most distinctly. I suspect Metz is better provisioned than the Germans suppose, and that they will have to return to the bombardment which the king had humanely ordered them to suspend.

"On returning to Remilly we stayed a short time at Courcelles, and found that a quarrel had occurred between the chief of the Johanniter there and the military commandant (which an English coadjutor might probably have appeased), and I was sorry to learn afterwards that the former, not being able to obtain reparation, had retired with, I suppose, his stores; so that it is probable there is a special opening at present for the English National Society at that place. The chief of the Johanniter Ritter at Courcelles is a most intelligent and gentlemanlike man, and speaks both French and English extremely well; indeed, nearly all the German officers I have met with can at least make themselves understood in French, and many in English.

"On our return to Remilly we were stopped by the sentry at the entrance of the village, as it was half-past seven, and no one was allowed to enter after seven; but two of us got leave to go in search of our Anglo-German officer, who escorted us back to your correspondent's lodgings, where I was entertained as hospitably as the nature of the case permitted, but had to sleep on a few handfulls of straw laid on the floor, with the aforesaid present from the British nation to the German army as my pillow.

"Next morning I returned to Saarbruck, and had another long and interesting conversation with some German officers. On reaching Saarbruck, I went with some English acquaintances to see if anything could be done in the way of establishing an hospital there, in anticipation of the fall of Metz, where typhus and dysentery prevail. We had an interview with the head of the local German medical staff, who told us that he thought the German Government would not be disposed to authorize the English National Society, under the circumstances, to establish such an hospital, and that, if more ambulance was required, the Government would supply them themselves; also, that the German Government did not wish to accept gifts of bread, meat, and other necessaries from any one (unless by some unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance a deficiency arose at any place); that he had power to order wine and any other comforts at the cost of his Government, where they were absolutely necessary; but that they would gladly receive wine, cigars, and other comforts which, though not rigorously necessary, were highly desirable for the use of the wounded, and for which at that moment there was want, as the Johanniter could not afford to give enough. The interview ended, I believe (for I left before its close), by an agent of the society obtaining permission, as a species of favour, to establish such an ambulance, under the supervision of the German Medical Chief, a condition to which few first-class English doctors would submit.

"From Saarbruck (after visiting the almost impregnable heights of Spicheren, which no troops but German or English

could, I believe, have taken, and where I found hardly any relics of the battle, and not a single bullet or fragment of shell) I went to Treves with one of the 'correspondents' of one of your contemporaries, who had been taken as a Prussian spy and rudely treated at Rheims; and thence I went home by way of Brussels, which is full to overflowing with rich French refugees from Paris, and where I had the utmost difficulty in securing a single bed.

"As I have animadverted on the management of the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, I think it right to state the course which I think should have been adopted by it, and which even now might be advantageously pursued; and I am confirmed in my views by an interview which I had with the North German Ambassador, who seemed to approve in the main of the views I entertain on that subject.

"The whole of the munificent contributions of the Germans for the Aid of the Sick and Wounded in war are distributed by the Johanniter Ritter, or Protestant Knights of St. John, for North Germany, and by the Johanniter Maltese Ritter, who are the Catholic Knights of Malta, for the South of Germany. Both of these bodies consist conclusively of German noblemen of rank and standing, who are as particular as the members of one of the best London clubs as to those of their order whom they will admit. The German Government place almost unlimited confidence in these Johanniter, who wear a uniform and cross, and a certain number are attached to each *corps d'armée*, which is complete in itself on the decentralized system, which is the antipodes of that of the French. The Johanniter can always obtain the use of the railway wagons, carriages, post, and telegraph free of expense; they can obtain supplies and horse transport by requisition at fair prices, instead of at the fancy prices extorted from our society; they work in concert with the military medical authorities; and they are aided by intelligent and practical men of business, who have volunteered in large numbers for the purpose. It appears to me that this system, though it may be open to some objections, is on the whole

admirable, and that the proper course for the National Society would be to send out an intelligent English gentleman, without salary, like one of the almoners of the Society for the Relief of Distress in London, aided perhaps by an intelligent clerk, to act in concert with the Johanniter in command at each German *corps d'armée*. The English agent should be a gentleman by birth and manners, and, if possible, one of those who sympathizes with the German cause. He should have cash or credit to an adequate amount, but no stores, excepting such articles as can be bought cheaper and better in London, or are given gratuitously. By concert with the Johanniter and his numerous and effective staff, the wants of the sick and wounded would be made known from day to day, or even from hour to hour, and each English agent could have frequent intercourse with the other English agents and with the *corps d'armée* for mutual advice and assistance, while he could communicate regularly, rapidly, and easily with the London Committee, while correspondence *via* Arlon is rare, tedious, and intermittent.

"As matters now stand we are likely to send, too late, abundance of stores which the Germans do not want, and which could usually be bought by them far cheaper, quicker, and better, while they will not receive in time a sufficiency of those things which they do want, and however munificent the English subscriptions are in money and in kind (the committee apparently not having taken the trouble of approximating to value the latter, which is much to be regretted), the Germans will only remember receiving too late, sometimes in inadequate doles and at other times in overpowering profusion, a lot of comparatively useless stores, which have been bought and transported at usurious rates, many of which will probably have to be sold at the end of the war for an old song. Even those who do not understand or believe in the good management of the Johanniter must surely see that the Germans would naturally prefer being aided chiefly through their own people, who know their wants, and not mainly by foreigners, who generally speak their language very imperfectly; and if so wildly improbable a contin-

gency had occurred as that the French had organized a national subscription for the relief of the distress in Lancashire caused by the cotton famine, and they had distributed their relief by a separate and expensive French organization, instead of by the English association under Lord Derby, every one would have considered their management wasteful and absurd in the extreme. A judicious Englishman might do much to correct any faults of the Johanniter system; and, besides the advantage which the English society would have derived from the gratuitous, intelligent, and zealous aid of the Johanniter, a contribution of £100,000 from England in money would have gone, probably both in appearance and reality, even further than £200,000 in stores, and would have given us an influence of a salutary and effective nature with these patriotic and intelligent German noblemen, besides endearing the name of England to every German heart, and removing, or at least mitigating, the bad impression justly produced by our refusal to prohibit the export of arms to either belligerent.

"With respect to the French, nothing can exceed the inefficiency and absurdity of their centralized system; and it seems to me absolutely essential that English agents and English medical men should be employed for them. On the other hand, as probably more than five-sixths of the sick and wounded of both nations are in the hands of the Germans, it would be evidently unfair to send half the money and stores to the French armies and hospitals, and it would be only just to proportion our gifts to the number of sick and wounded with each army as nearly as can be calculated. The stores of the society should have been at Libramont, which is by far the nearest railway station to Sedan, or at the adjoining village; and, if adequate storage could not have been obtained, wooden sheds could have been immediately and cheaply erected for both stores, lodging, and stabling.

"These stores would then have been within a few hours' journey by cart from Sedan, instead of two days' distance, as at Arlon, where the stores were only begun to be warehoused on

the 9th of September from Luxembourg, instead of sending them direct to Sedan, and the transport would have cost exactly half what it now amounts to, or less than one-quarter if the stores were weighed, and full loads sent instead of less than half loads, as usually forwarded by the agent. The depôt at Libramont would have had the further enormous advantage of being at the point at which nearly all the wounded joined the railway, and where incalculable good could have been done, and probably many lives saved, by daily giving them various comforts which they actually much required, while all that they actually got, so far as I could see, was some bread and butter, water and cigars, from the Belgians and Germans. In fact, all but the English stores passed by Libramont.

"I may add that by a letter in the *Times* it appears that the Anglo-German Society for the Wounded, with much more limited means, but with judicious, timely, and bold liberality, has spent more on the spot than our National Society, with all its enormous resources, and has even had to come to the rescue of our Anglo-American ambulance at Sedan, where there were hardly any other than French patients; that I am told the individual I was not allowed to assist at Arlon with the stores, and whom I considered utterly inefficient, but who, the society's agent told me, was one of the best storekeepers in Europe, is no longer in their employment; and Mr. Churchward, of Dover, informed me that he believed the stores of the society sent by Calais were simply put into the French Government warehouse there, instead of being sent forward for the wounded.

"I make many apologies for trespassing so long on your space and on your readers' patience, which extreme haste and the importance of the subject can alone justify.

"Thurso Castle, Caithness, Sept. 26.

"P.S.—While writing the foregoing I was surprised to see a letter in the *Times* of Friday last from Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, stating that the London Committee is engaged in sending out an ambulance and twelve waggons from England with Dr. Longmore, &c., and that the North German Ambassador promises to

give permission to convey a large stock of 'chloroform' through the Prussian lines into the 'besieged cities' of Metz, Strasburg, and 'Montmedy.' I believe there are already far too many English surgeons and too few dressers, nurses, and clerks at the seat of war; and I should like to see a return of the work actually performed by each, as I know some who, when I left, had done absolutely nothing, and could find nothing to do; and except the Anglo-American ambulance at Sedan under Drs. Sime and Frank, which is only partially connected with the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, I believe comparatively little good has been done by the English surgeons sent out, generally without any fault of their own, as the foreign surgeons and chiefs of ambulances keep nearly all the operations jealously to themselves. Why not, therefore, utilize those already there instead of sending others? As to wagons, &c., they could be bought or hired infinitely cheaper and better close to the seat of war.

"As no sortie has been made from Metz since September 1, probably no surgical operations are now requisite, and, therefore, chloroform is most likely unnecessary there; and, as Metz is suffering from typhus and dysentery, other drugs, and not chloroform, are required.

"I was at Montmedy on the 11th inst., which is a mere village, and not a 'city,' and which was not then, and I believe is not now, 'besieged;' and, as I gave the druggists and medical men there, as I afterwards did at Sedan (where I found many drugs at the shops, of which there were supposed to be none), the address of a Brussels physician who would put them in communication with the Brussels chemist (which, of course, the French Ambassador or Consul there would have also done), and as there were only about twenty sick and wounded at that place, I refused to give them chloroform, of which I had abundance, finding that they had sufficient for the present, and could easily, cheaply, and speedily obtain all necessary supplies."

The following letter appeared in the *Times*:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—Observing in the *Times* of Tuesday, received to-day, a letter from Captain Brackenbury, in which he attempts to reply to my letter in the *Times* on the subject of the mismanagement of the London Committee and local agents of the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, I have to request your permission to state—

1. That on the 8th of September the English Minister at Brussels was not even aware where I could find the agent of the National Society, and the Secretaire-General of the Belgian Society for Aid to the Wounded (Dr. Holsbeek) told me that he thought the stores were at Bouillon.

2. A store could have been built of wood at Libramont by a contractor from Namur or elsewhere before the agent could have brought his bales and cases from Luxembourg, and store room could have been hired at the adjoining village to Libramont and at Bouillon on paying an adequate price. Waggons and carts could have been hired from the villages round Libramont and the adjoining towns, as was done by the Germans, and wine, cigars, and other comforts and necessaries could have been ordered by telegraph and sent by rail to Libramont.

3. From Arlon to Sedan occupied two days by waggon, while from Libramont to Sedan was a one day's journey.

4. The Anglo-American ambulance at Sedan was so badly supplied, as appears by Dr. Hart's report, that they were obliged to send special messengers to London for stores, which arrived the day after an enormous consignment from Arlon.

5. Your readers will observe that the correspondents of the *Times* at the headquarters before Paris, before Metz, and at Strasburg, unanimously condemn the mismanagement of the National Society, and that opinion is confirmed in the strongest terms by the correspondent of the *Scotsman*.

I may add that I was much amused on leaving Saarbruck for Remilly early in the morning to find that one of the agents of

the society had followed me in haste to the station in order to deliver to me a parcel containing the following articles:—Two or three bandages, one small bottle of Liebig, about a yard of lint, and as much wadding, two pairs of socks, one pair of slippers, two shirts, two flannel vests, two pair of drawers, two pocket handkerchiefs, a bottle of opium pills, and a bottle of other pills, as a present from the English National Society to the wounded and sick of the German army of 300,000 men before Metz!

Yours obediently,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

FROM THE "MORNING ADVERTISER."

Amongst the many interesting communications which have reached this country from the seat of war with respect to the condition of the sick and wounded, and the arrangements which have been made for their relief, we have read none more deserving of attention than that which has been published from the pen of Sir Tollemache Sinclair. Other writers have mainly confined themselves to the vast field which the war has opened to the philanthropy of all who could contribute either in money or in kind, or in personal service, to assuage the sufferings of those who have fallen in this disastrous war; or they have described, as far as language could do, the more shocking features of the misery which has come under their notice. The motives prompting these communications are as excellent as the good they have effected has been great. They have served to stimulate the compassion of the people of this country, ever ready to respond to such appeals, and they have thereby been the means of saving many lives, and of soothing the last hours of hundreds of poor fellows who were wounded beyond hope of recovery.

But none of the writers of these letters have attempted to criticise the mode in which relief has been administered, or to suggest an improvement upon that which has been adopted. And yet, when we consider how suddenly the war broke out, and how little time there was to organize a system of ambu-

lances and other hospitals, we should not be surprised to find that the arrangements of our Central Committee have not been as good as they no doubt would have been with more time for deliberation. It is upon this point that Sir Tollemache's letter, interesting as it is in other respects, deserves our primary attention at this moment. How long this disastrous war will last it is impossible to predict, but unhappily it cannot be doubted that before it can be fought out to the bitter end thousands of soldiers who are to-day unhurt will be in need of all the help we can bestow upon them. It is, therefore, of the utmost consequence that we should look about us, and see whether it is not possible for us to use our resources to better purpose than hitherto, and any evidence that can help us to form an opinion upon this point ought not to be neglected.

We, therefore, turn to Sir T. Sinclair's letter, not only because anything proceeding from him merits attention, but because he has carefully examined this subject, and has been in communication, in regard to it, with those who may be supposed to have a thorough understanding of what is needed. We learn, in the first place, with surprise that a proposition which Sir Tollemache and some English friends made with a view to establishing an hospital at Saarbruck, in anticipation of the fall of Metz, was not favourably entertained by the chief of the local German medical staff, who expressed his belief that the German Government would not be disposed to authorize the English National Society under any circumstances to establish such an hospital, and that if more ambulances were required, the Government would supply them themselves. The result of the interview with this gentleman seems to have been that the society obtained permission, "as a kind of favour," to establish such an ambulance, but with the condition that it should be under the supervision of the German medical chief. Something like a reflection upon the mode in which the society has organized its resources seems to be conveyed in the exaction of this condition, and Sir T. Sinclair details at length the course he thinks it ought to have pursued, and which it is, unhappily, not even yet too late to adopt.

It must be remembered that the Germans already possess an organization through which their own contributions have been administered, and which has the advantage that it has not been extemporized to meet a sudden necessity, but has long been in existence. It is composed of the Johanniter Ritter, or Protestant Knights of St. John, for North Germany, and the Johanniter Maltese Ritter, or Catholic Knights of Malta, for South Germany. "Both of these bodies," Sir Tollemache writes, "consist exclusively of German noblemen of rank and standing, who are as particular as the members of one of the best London clubs as to those of their order whom they will admit." In these bodies the German Governments have almost unlimited confidence, and place railway waggons, carriages, post, and telegraph at their disposal, free of expense. Moreover, they can obtain supplies and horse transport by requisition at fair prices, while those extorted from our National Society are described as "fancy prices." They are in concert with the military medical authorities, and they are aided by intelligent and practical men of business, who have volunteered in large numbers for the purpose.

Sir T. Sinclair is of opinion that the system is, on the whole, admirable, and that the proper course for the National Society would be "to send out an intelligent English gentleman, without salary, like one of the almoners of the Society for the Relief of Distress in London, aided, perhaps, by an intelligent clerk, to act in concert with the Johanniter in command at each German corps d'armée." By this means he thinks that the wants of the sick and wounded would be known from day to day, or even from hour to hour, while "each English agent could have frequent intercourse with the other English agents and with the corps d'armée for mutual advice and assistance," and "could communicate regularly, rapidly, and easily with the London committee," whereas "correspondence *viâ* Arlon is rare, tedious, and intermittent." Unless good reason can be shown why there should be several independent organizations working without concert, or with only spasmodic concert, for the same end, this advice seems to be sound.

Independent action is not conducive to what is familiarly known in this country as "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together." We can quite believe that upon the system we are at present pursuing we are in danger of sending, too late, an abundance of stores which the Germans do not want, and which they can obtain cheaper and better than from us, while they will not receive in time a sufficiency of the things of which they are in need. It is not only possible but probable that our supplies will at times reach them in inadequate doles, and at others in such overpowering profusion that they will be useless.

Again, is it not a mistake to have fixed the head-quarters of the National Society at Arlon? Sir T. Sinclair does not stand alone in maintaining that it would have been better to have established them at Libramont, where they would have been within a few hours' journey of Sedan, instead of a journey of two days. Time and money would have been saved by such an arrangement, and the great object for which we are labouring would have been accomplished with far greater ease and effect. We confess that there is too much reason to doubt whether, in the desire to act upon an independent plan, we have not, to a great extent, neutralized the means at our disposal. It is not, however, too late to correct this error; and we are confident that a prejudiced adherence to its own views will not, as undoubtedly it ought not, prevent the Central Committee from adopting a better plan than its hastily-improvised organization permitted, if such a plan can be suggested, as we believe it has been in Sir T. Sinclair's letter.

The following letter appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*:—

SIR,—Independently of Mr. J. Stuart Mill and Mr. Froude, whose able, bold, and convincing letters against war with Russia I have read with much satisfaction, I have received letters from several members of Parliament, expressing the same views; and I am confident that, if all England was polled by universal suffrage, the immense majority would be against war on account of the step which Russia has announced her intention of now taking.

It should be observed that Russia can build any number of the largest men-of-war in the Sea of Azov or the Dnieper without violating the Treaty of Paris; or she could, as in the case of the "Alabama" and the steam rams, build large men-of-war on the pretext that they were merchantmen, and keep their armament separate. Again, if she had a fixed intention of conquering Turkey, she could build a fleet of any size or strength in the Baltic or in America; and iron-plated men-of-war could force the Dardanelles more easily than it was done by a British admiral with wooden vessels many years ago.

I am one of those who totally disapproved of the Crimean war, and who long to see a Greek Empire established in European Turkey, or else that Russia will expel the handful of Mussulmans who so grievously oppress the enormous majority of the population, who are Christians. I do not believe that it would necessarily follow that because Russia acquired Turkey she would annex Egypt, and which, as compared with Turkey, is well and wisely governed. In any case, however, if the supposed interests of England are to interfere with progress and the rights of millions of oppressed Christians, the philanthropist will consider us selfish and tyrannical oppressors; and if we should, as is at least possible, meet with a disastrous defeat, and, like the French, have to submit to humiliating and ruinous terms, it would be thought that we deserved our fate. It is most likely that the Americans, in case of war, would fit out hosts of privateers, who would hoist American colours when they met our men-of-war, and the Russian when none were near, and they would then burn and destroy our shipping and our maritime towns, the end of which would, of course, be a war with the United States. As to our honour obliging us to fight, I have to observe that, at the beginning of this century, private duelling was considered as obligatory as some pretend that international duelling still is. If any man did not challenge and kill any individual who called him a liar or a scoundrel, he was considered a coward, wanting in all sense of honour; but now, even for such a heinous and irreparable injury as the seduction of a wife—as may be observed

by a recent remarkable trial—no one is expected to challenge the wrong-doer; and public opinion, so far from thinking a man a coward, would strongly disapprove of a duel being fought even in such a case; and if the injured man challenged the seducer and killed him, it would be certainly a crime for which he would be severely punished.

In the same way I consider international duelling both a folly and a crime, and that war is only justifiable to defend our shores or colonies, and not for any verbal offence or repudiation of unjust or humiliating treaties, or to protect other nations, who are never grateful to us for officious meddling.

Surely, after allowing the partition of Poland, the annexation of Nice and Savoy, and the dismemberment of Denmark, we cannot dream of going to war on behalf of Turkey. As an Englishman and a member of Parliament I protest against sending another 20,000 men to the European shambles, to be killed for a Quixotic idea, and I also strongly deprecate sacrificing another £70,000,000 of treasure, as in the Crimean war, the interest of which would give us a free breakfast table, and remove most of the taxes which fall so oppressively and so unjustly on the poor.

If the editors of those newspapers who, with vicarious courage, attempt to goad the nation into war, and all bellicose M.P.'s had to go to the war, as in Prussia—and I would wish them sent to the very front of the battle—there would be as many advocates for peace among the ruling class, in proportion, as amongst the people at large.—Your obedient servant,

J. G. Tollemache Sinclair, M.P.

The following letter in reply to that from the pen of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, M.P., has appeared in the *Times*:—

Sir,—My attention has been called to a letter in your journal of September 30, headed "Sick and Wounded," from Sir J. G. T. Sinclair, M.P., in which a remark is made that may mislead the public, and it also implies a want of judgment and

management on the part of the chief agent (Captain Brackenbury, R.A.) of the Society for the Sick and Wounded. As he is so far away, will you allow me to state the facts in justice to him and the society ?

It states that the society's stores ought to have been at Libramont instead of Arlon. Your correspondent is quite right, and such was the intention; but no stores were to be had, nor a small shed to make into a store-room. To erect one was out of the question; all the workmen were gone off in the Belgian army, and no wood was to be had. The stationmaster stated that if the waggons were sent there he could not receive them, having more than he could attend to. At this time the railway trucks containing the stores belonging to the Belgian Government were being charged for their detention. Arlon has also other advantages even superior to Luxembourg, there being a banker there; bread, hams, and sausages cooked, with wine and cigars, at a moment's notice; carts can be had there, not Libramont. I can understand that a superficial observer, without inquiry, would make this mistake. There was another most important consideration which I afterwards found to be correct; no forage or any food for man or beast was to be had on the road from Libramont to Sedan—all was taken by the Belgian and Dutch ambulances and the prisoners.

Captain Brackenbury, with some difficulty, obtained from the Bourgomestre of Arlon the use of the rooms and vaults under the Palais de Justice. Bad as they were, I think in no other town in that part of the country could their equal be found for accommodation at the moment.

I will give your correspondent every credit for his exertions. He received the first goods into the stores at Arlon while I was unloading the railway trucks. Not knowing him, I imagined him to be some person accustomed to the storehouses of Lower Thames Street, and he most certainly deserves the thanks of the society for his exertions, independent of the good he did afterwards. If he had remained in Arlon another twelve hours he would have found that all his suggestions had been carried out.

Those of your readers who know what warehousing is will appreciate those exertions when I mention that there were 1,000 pairs of blankets, 600 cases and bales of linen bandages, clothing, &c., 40 cases, &c., of provisions, 30 cases of medicine, 20 cases of wines and spirits, and 20 cases, &c., of bottled beer, barrels of plaster of Paris, and various other cases; that all the medicine cases had to be unpacked, sorted, and re-packed, the same with linen and extract of meat, and that 16 waggons had to be loaded with an assortment of these articles, all within 24 hours. To weigh all these goods was an impossibility with the staff we had; we were obliged to judge their weight, and some wagons could not hold so much as others, while some had to travel with three horses instead of one in consequence of the roads; hence the difference in weight. If they had been railway trucks instead of country waggons it would have been different. Although the journey was longer and the cost of transport greater from Arlon than it would have been from Libramont, I consider that there was no alternative but to select Arlon as the depôt.

In reference to his remarks about the Johanniter Ritter, or Protestant Knights of St. John, and also the Johanniter Maltese Ritter, whom he calls the Catholic Knights of Malta, your Masonic readers will know that these orders combine both Protestants and Catholics, and being a member of both, and meeting with a "companion" on leaving Arlon, I affiliated myself with them, and thus visited all the ambulances in the vicinity of Sedan up to Rheims, and I have seen the great good done by the English Society from the stores sent from Arlon; at the same time I did more good in my own profession. I never had occasion to show my passport, being taken for an Alsatian. Nurses are not now required, and what was wanted were women of the country, not English ladies.

He is quite right in stating that the Germans will not allow English doctors to interfere; even those engaged by the Ambassador in London are only allowed to act as dressers; they will take anything you like to give them in the way of

stores. The French are different, but exceedingly jealous of our interference.

From what I have seen, I consider that next to the Johanniter the English Society have done the most good, even more so than the Anglo-American Ambulance, because we have not confined ourselves to one place, but wherever it was required there we have been, and Captain Brackenbury and Mr. Furley have achieved wonders.

I beg to add that I went out as an unpaid servant of the society, and that as soon as a paid storekeeper arrived I left, and made my way to the seat of war, all of which has been so ably described by your correspondent.

There now remains plenty of work for the doctors in the shape of typhus, but surgeons must go west of Paris.

I remain, yours, &c.,

GEORGE WARRINER,

Late Storekeeper at Arlon to the Society for the Relief of the Sick and Wounded.

London, Oct. 3.

Truth says:—"Lady Strangford is moving heaven and earth to get an audience of the Sultan in order to receive his Majesty's thanks for her disinterested labours among the Bulgarians. Neither the lady nor her labours are popular in Turkish society. She has not pulled well with her nurses, and is now homeward bound with an exhausted exchequer and no accounts worth mentioning.

"In Bulgaria the chiefs of the two rival relief funds are called the King and the Queen. The King himself sits arrayed in a white cravat and silk stockings and pumps, a number of blankets on one side of him for distribution among the Bulgarians, and a few bottles of champagne on the other side for the delectation of himself and his friends. He has an excellent French cook, and, although the Bulgarians may starve, takes good care himself to fare sumptuously.

"The outbreak of war has deprived the Bulgarians of their King and Queen. The latter suddenly discovered that the health

of the district in which her charities were bestowed was so far restored that no further need existed for her hospitals. They were accordingly closed, and her staff of volunteer doctors disbanded and left to shift for themselves. Disgusted with the ingratitude of the Bulgarians, she will make her next appearance as ministering angel to the wounded soldiers of the Sultan, and, backed by the Stafford House Fund, will gather a further crop of laurels from the inexhaustible field of Turkish gratitude. Bracelets are no longer in vogue, but the Osmanli will form a brilliant addition to the many orders which adorn the bosom of this indefatigable little woman. . . . . He (the King) no sooner heard of her flight than he prepared to follow, and made a pompous progress as soon as his friend the Bulgarian bishop could collect, by hook or by crook, a sufficiently imposing following through Bajardzik to the railway station. There, in a long-winded speech, he bade farewell to the impracticable Bulgarians, whom he had failed to convince that his method of housing them in crowded barracks, badly built of rough sawn boards, was superior to their old custom, where each family lived in a separate house in its own grounds. Both (King and Queen) are greedy of the glory of distributing public money, and it is generally supposed that their Majesties will run a hard race for the Stafford House Guineas."

PHOTOGRAPH OF AN M.P., BY DICKENS.

THE obstructives in the present Parliament, who propose amendments which they admit to be nonsensical, and who talk by the hour, or rather by the yard or mile, to a wearied and irritated audience, whilst the reporters hardly take down a single word, resemble, and will probably meet with some such reception from their constituents as that depicted in the following graphic photograph written by the inimitable Boz:—

"'Gentlemen,' said Mr. Gregsbury, 'you are welcome. I am rejoiced to see you.'

"For a gentleman who was rejoiced to see a body of visitors, Mr. Gregsbury looked as uncomfortable as might be; but perhaps this was occasioned by senatorial gravity, and a statesman-like habit of keeping his feelings under control. He was a tough, burly, thick-headed gentleman, with a loud voice, a pompous manner, a tolerable command of sentences with no meaning in them, and, in short, every requisite for a very good member indeed.

"'Now, gentlemen,' said Mr. Gregsbury, tossing a great bundle of papers into a wicker basket at his feet, and throwing himself back in his chair with his arms over the elbows, 'you are dissatisfied with my conduct, I see by the newspapers.'

"'Yes, Mr. Gregsbury, we are,' said a plump old gentleman in a violent heat, bursting out of the throng, and planting himself in the front.

"'Do my eyes deceive me,' said Mr. Gregsbury, looking towards the speaker, 'or is that my old friend Pugstyles?

"'I am that man, and no other, sir,' replied the plump old gentleman.

"Give me your hand, my worthy friend,' said Mr. Gregsbury. 'Pugstyles, my dear friend, I am very sorry to see you here.'

"'I am very sorry to be here, sir,' said Mr. Pugstyles; 'but your conduct, Mr. Gregsbury, has rendered this deputation from your constituents imperatively necessary.'

"'My conduct, Pugstyles,' said Mr. Gregsbury, looking round upon the deputation with gracious magnanimity—'My conduct has been, and ever will be, regulated by a sincere regard for the true and real interests of this great and happy country. Whether I look at home or abroad; whether I behold the peaceful industrious communities of our island home; her rivers covered with steamboats, her roads with locomotives, her streets with cabs, her skies with balloons of a power and magnitude hitherto unknown in the history of aëronautics in this or any other nation — say, whether I look merely at home, or, stretching my eyes farther, contemplate the boundless prospect of conquest and possession—achieved by British perseverance and British valour —which is outstretched before me, I clasp my hands, and turning my eyes to the broad expanse above my head, exclaim, "Thank heaven, I am a Briton!'"

"The time had been when this burst of enthusiasm would have been cheered to the very echo; but now the deputation received it with chilling coldness. The general impression seemed to be, that as an explanation of Mr. Gregsbury's political conduct, it did not enter quite enough into detail; and one gentleman in the rear did not scruple to remark aloud that, for his purpose, it savoured rather too much of a 'gammon' tendency.

"'The meaning of that term—gammon,' said Mr. Gregsbury, 'is unknown to me. If it means that I grow a little too fervid, or perhaps even hyperbolical, in extolling my native land, I admit the full justice of the remark. I *am* proud of this free and happy country. My form dilates, my eye glistens, my breast heaves, my heart swells, my bosom burns, when I call to mind her greatness and her glory.'

"'We wish, sir,' remarked Mr. Pugstyles calmly, 'to ask you a few questions.'

"'If you please, gentlemen; my time is yours—and my country's—and my country's'—said Mr. Gregsbury.

This permission being conceded, Mr. Pugstyles put on his spectacles, and referred to a written paper which he drew from his pocket; whereupon nearly every other member of the deputation pulled a written paper from *his* pocket, to check Mr. Pugstyles off, as he read the questions.

"This done, Mr. Pugstyles proceeded to business.

"'Question number one.—Whether, sir, you did not give a voluntary pledge previous to your election, that in event of your being returned, you would immediately put down the practice of coughing and groaning in the House of Commons? And whether you did not submit to be coughed and groaned down in the very first debate of the session, and have since made no effort to effect a reform in this respect? Whether you did not also pledge yourself to astonish the Government, and make them shrink in their shoes? And whether you have astonished them, and made them shrink in their shoes, or not?'

"'Go on to the next one, my dear Pugstyles,' said Mr. Gregsbury.

"'Have you any explanation to offer with reference to that question, sir?' asked Mr. Pugstyles.

"'Certainly not,' said Mr. Gregsbury.

"The members of the deputation looked fiercely at each other, and afterwards at the member. 'Dear Pugstyles' having taken a very long stare at Mr. Gregsbury over the tops of his spectacles, resumed his list of inquiries.

"'Question number two.—Whether, sir, you did not likewise give a voluntary pledge that you would support your colleague on every occasion; and whether you did not, the night before last, desert him and vote upon the other side, because the wife of a leader on that other side had invited Mrs. Gregsbury to an evening party?'

"'Go on,' said Mr. Gregsbury.

"'Nothing to say on that, either, sir?' asked the spokesman.

"'Nothing whatever,' replied Mr. Gregsbury.

"The deputation, who had only seen him at canvassing or election time, were struck dumb by his coolness. He didn't appear like the same man; then he was all milk and honey; now he was all starch and vinegar. But men *are* so different at different times!

"'Question number three—and last,' said Mr. Pugstyles emphatically. 'Whether, sir, you did not state upon the hustings, that it was your firm and determined intention to oppose everything proposed; to divide the House upon every question, to move for returns on every subject, to place a motion on the books every day, and, in short, in your own memorable words, to play the very devil with everything and everybody?' With this comprehensive inquiry, Mr. Pugstyles folded up his list of questions, as did all his backers.

"Mr. Gregsbury reflected, blew his nose, threw himself further back in his chair, came forward again, leaning his elbows on the table, made a triangle with his two thumbs and his two forefingers, and tapping his nose with the apex thereof, replied (smiling as he said it), 'I deny everything.'

"At this unexpected answer, a hoarse murmur arose from the deputation; and the same gentleman who had expressed an opinion relative to the gammoning nature of the introductory speech, again made a monosyllabic demonstration, by growling out 'Resign!' Which growl being taken up by his fellows, swelled into a very earnest and general remonstrance.

"'I am requested, sir, to express a hope,' said Mr. Pugstyles, with a distant bow, 'that on receiving a requisition to that effect from a great majority of your constituents, you will not object at once to resign your seat in favour of some candidate whom they think they can better trust.'

"To this, Mr. Gregsbury read the following reply, which, anticipating the request, he had composed in the form of a letter, whereof copies had been made to send round to the newspapers.

"'My dear Mr. Pugstyles,

"'Next to the welfare of our beloved island—this great and free and happy country, whose powers and resources are, I sincerely believe, illimitable—I value that noble independence which is an Englishman's proudest boast, and which I fondly hope to bequeath to my children, untarnished and unsullied. Actuated by no personal motives, but moved only by high and great constitutional considerations; which I will not attempt to explain, for they are really beneath the comprehension of those who have not made themselves masters, as I have, of the intricate and arduous study of politics; I would rather keep my seat, and intend doing so.

"'Will you do me the favour to present my compliments to the constituent body, and acquaint them with this circumstance?

"'With great esteem,

"'My dear Mr. Pugstyles,

"'&c., &c.'

"'Then you will not resign, under any circumstances?' asked the spokesman.

"Mr. Gregsbury smiled, and shook his head.

"'Then, good morning, sir,' said Pugstyles, angrily.

"'Heaven bless you!' said Mr. Gregsbury. And the deputation, with many growls and scowls, filed off as quickly as the narrowness of the staircase would allow of their getting down.

"The last man being gone, Mr. Gregsbury rubbed his hands and chuckled, as merry fellows will, when they think they have said or done a more than commonly good thing; he was so engrossed in this self-congratulation, that he did not observe that Nicholas had been left behind in the shadow of the window-curtains, until that young gentleman, fearing he might otherwise overhear some soliloquy intended to have no listeners coughed twice or thrice, to attract the member's notice.

"'What's that?' said Mr. Gregsbury, in sharp accents.

"Nicholas stepped forward and bowed.

"'What do you do here, sir?' asked Mr. Gregsbury; 'a spy upon my privacy! A concealed voter! You have heard my answer, sir. Pray follow the deputation.'

"'I should have done so, if I had belonged to it, but I do not,' said Nicholas.

"'Then how came you here, sir?' was the natural inquiry of Mr. Gregsbury, M.P. 'And where the devil have you come from, sir?' was the question which followed it.

"'I brought this card from the General Agency Office, sir,' said Nicholas, 'wishing to offer myself as your secretary, and understanding that you stood in need of one.'

"'That's all you have come for, is it?' said Mr. Gregsbury, eyeing him in some doubt.

"Nicholas replied in the affirmative.

"'You have no connexion with any of those rascally papers, have you?' said Mr. Gregsbury. 'You didn't get into the room to hear what was going forward, and put it in print, eh?'

"'I have no connexion, I am sorry to say, with anything at present,' rejoined Nicholas,—politely enough, but quite at his ease.

"'Oh!' said Mr. Gregsbury. 'How did you find your way up here, then?'

"Nicholas related how he had been forced up by the deputation.

"'That was the way, was it?' said Mr. Gregsbury. 'Sit down.'

"Nicholas took a chair, and Mr. Gregsbury stared at him for a long time, as if to make certain, before he asked any further questions, that there were no objections to his outward appearance.

"'You want to be my secretary, do you?' he said at length.

"'I wish to be employed in that capacity, sir,' replied Nicholas.

"'Well,' said Mr. Gregsbury; 'now what can you do?'

"'I suppose,' replied Nicholas, smiling, 'that I can do what usually falls to the lot of other secretaries.'

"'What's that?' inquired Mr. Gregsbury.

"'What is it?' replied Nicholas.

"'Ah! What is it?' retorted the member, looking shrewdly at him, with his head on one side.

"'A secretary's duties are rather difficult to define, perhaps,' said Nicholas, considering. 'They include, I presume, correspondence?'

"'Good,' interposed Mr. Gregsbury.

"'The arrangement of papers and documents?'

"'Very good.'

"'Occasionally, perhaps, the writing from your dictation; and possibly, sir,'—said Nicholas, with a half smile, 'the copying of your speech for some public journal, when you have made one of more than usual importance.'

"'Certainly,' rejoined Mr. Gregsbury. 'What else?'

"'Really,' said Nicholas, after a moment's reflection, 'I am not able, at this instant, to recapitulate any other duty of a secretary, beyond the general one of making himself as agreeable and useful to his employer as he can, consistently with his own respectability, and without overstepping that line of duties which he undertakes to perform, and which the designation of his office is usually understood to imply.'

"Mr. Gregsbury looked fixedly at Nicholas for a short time, and then glancing warily round the room, said in a suppressed voice—

"'This is all very well, Mr. —— what is your name?'

"'Nickleby.'

"'This is all very well, Mr. Nickleby, and very proper, so far as it goes—so far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. There are other duties, Mr. Nickleby, which a secretary to a parliamentary gentleman must never lose sight of. I should require to be crammed, sir.'

"'I beg your pardon,' interposed Nicholas, doubtful whether he had heard aright.

"'— To be crammed, sir,' repeated Mr. Gregsbury.

"'May I beg your pardon again, if I inquire what you mean, sir?' said Nicholas.

"'My meaning, sir, is perfectly plain,' replied Mr. Gregsbury, with a solemn aspect. 'My secretary would have to make himself master of the foreign policy of the world, as it is mirrored in the newspapers; to run his eye over all accounts of public meetings, all leading articles, and accounts of the proceedings of public bodies; and to make notes of anything which it appeared to him might be made a point of, in any little speech upon the question of some petition lying on the table, or anything of that kind. Do you understand?'

"'I think I do, sir,' replied Nicholas.

"'Then,' said Mr. Gregsbury, 'it would be necessary for him to make himself acquainted, from day to day, with newspaper paragraphs on passing events; such as "Mysterious disappearance, and supposed suicide of a pot-boy," or anything of that sort, upon which I might found a question to the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Then, he would have to copy the question, and as much as I remembered of the answer (including a little compliment about independence and good sense); and to send the manuscript in a frank to the local paper, with perhaps half a dozen lines of leader, to the effect, that I was always to be found in my place in Parliament, and never shrunk from the responsible and arduous duties, and so forth. You see?'

"Nicholas bowed.

"'Besides which,' continued Mr. Gregsbury, 'I should expect him, now and then, to go through a few figures in the printed tables, and to pick out a few results, so that I might come out pretty well on timber duty questions, and finance questions, and so on; and I should like him to get up a few little arguments about the disastrous effects of a return to cash payments and a metallic currency, with a touch now and then about the exportation of bullion, and the Emperor of Russia, and bank notes, and all that kind of thing, which it's only necessary to talk fluently about, because nobody understands it. Do you take me?'

"'I think I understand,' said Nicholas.

"'With regard to such questions as are not political,' con-

tinued Mr. Gregsbury, warming; 'and which one can't be expected to care a curse about, beyond the natural care of not allowing inferior people to be as well off as ourselves—else where are our privileges?—I should wish my secretary to get together a few little flourishing speeches, of a patriotic cast. For instance, if any preposterous bill were brought forward, for giving poor grubbing devils of authors a right to their own property, I should like to say, that I for one would never consent to opposing an insurmountable bar to the diffusion of literature among *the people*, —you understand?—that the creations of the pocket, being man's, might belong to one man, or one family; but that the creations of the brain, being God's, ought as a matter of course to belong to the people at large—and if I was pleasantly disposed, I should like to make a joke about posterity, and say that those who wrote for posterity should be content to be rewarded by the approbation *of* posterity; it might take with the house, and could never do me any harm, because posterity can't be expected to know anything about me or my jokes either—do you see.'

"'I see that, sir,' replied Nicholas.

"'You must always bear in mind, in such cases as this, where our interests are not affected,' said Mr. Gregsbury, 'to put it very strong about the people, because it comes out very well at election-time; and you could be as funny as you liked about the authors; because I believe the greater part of them live in lodgings, and are not voters. This is a hasty outline of the chief things you'd have to do, except waiting in the lobby every night, in case I forgot anything, and should want fresh cramming; and, now and then, during great debates, sitting in the front row of the gallery, and saying to the people about—"You see that gentleman, with his hand to his face, and his arm twisted round that pillar—that's Mr. Gregsbury—the celebrated Mr. Gregsbury—" with any other little eulogium that might strike you at the moment. And for salary,' said Mr. Gregsbury, winding up with great rapidity; for he was out of breath—'And for salary, I don't mind saying at once in round numbers, to prevent any dissatisfaction—though it's more than I have been accustomed to give—fifteen shillings a week, and find yourself. There!'

"With this handsome offer, Mr. Gregsbury once more threw himself back in his chair, and looked like a man who had been most profligately liberal, but is determined not to repent of it notwithstanding.

"'Fifteen shillings a week is not much,' said Nicholas mildly.

"'Not much! Fifteen shillings a week not much, young man?' cried Mr. Gregsbury. 'Fifteen shillings a——'

"'Pray do not suppose that I quarrel with the sum, sir,' replied Nicholas; 'for I am not ashamed to confess, that whatever it may be in itself, to me it is a great deal. But the duties and responsibilities make the recompense small, and they are so very heavy that I fear to undertake them.'

"'Do you decline to undertake them, sir?' inquired Mr. Gregsbury, with his hand on the bell-rope.

"'I fear they are too great for my powers, however good my will may be, sir,' replied Nicholas.

"'That is as much as to say that you had rather not accept the place, and that you consider fifteen shillings a week too little,' said Mr. Gregsbury, ringing. 'Do you decline it, sir?'

"'I have no alternative but to do so,' replied Nicholas.

"'Door, Matthews!' said Mr. Gregsbury, as the boy appeared.

"'I am sorry I have troubled you unnecessarily, sir,' said Nicholas.

"'I am sorry you have,' rejoined Mr. Gregsbury, turning his back upon him. 'Door, Matthews!'

"'Good morning, sir,' said Nicholas.

"'Door, Matthews!' cried Mr. Gregsbury.

"The boy beckoned Nicholas, and tumbling lazily down stairs before him, opened the door, and ushered him into the street. With a sad and pensive air, he retraced his steps homewards."

THE

GREAT BATTLE OF *KATSH-TARTAR BAZARDJIK.

THE *Blood and Thunder Gazette* has killed so many Russians on paper in their long and unbroken series of imaginary Turkish victories that one wonders how a single Cossack is left to fight on the Muscovite side, unless the Czar can instantaneously raise soldiers by sowing an unlimited number of dragons' teeth. The following telegram has this instant been received by the *Blood and Thunder Gazette*, from their veracious correspondent, the well known Baron Munchausen† :—

FROM THE SPECIAL TWENTY-FOURTH EDITION OF THE "BLOOD AND THUNDER GAZETTE."

GLORIOUS TURKISH VICTORY!

SEDAN OUTDONE!!!

DEFEAT AND CAPTURE OF THE WHOLE RUSSIAN ARMY BY A TURKISH FORCE OF LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF THEIR NUMBER!!!!

234,567 RUSSIANS KILLED, WOUNDED, AND MISSING!!!!!!

THE TURKISH ARMY MARCHING ON ST. PETERSBURG!!!!!!!!

"The Russian army, 502,200 strong, all veterans, with 1,010 Krupp guns, were most advantageously posted at the top of an

* This is a common Turkish word. "Katsh grush" is, "How many piastres?"
† The impartial Baron is *Gay*—with a decoration.

elevated plateau, with perpendicular mountains behind and on both sides, and a deep morass in front, whilst the Turks were, by the necessities of the case, and not from any want of military skill on the part of their able leaders, most disadvantageously placed in a low-lying valley, their army consisting of precisely 49,999 men, all recruits, with 101 guns, all smooth bores.

"We all know the saying, 'Scratch the Russian and you will find the Tartar,' and, by a singular coincidence, the Turks, who are all born gentlemen, came up with the Russian forces, which were exclusively composed of serfs, at Katsh-Tartar Bazardjik, which your readers will find incorrectly spelt Tatar Bazardjik, at the foot of the Balkans.

"The battle took place on the fifteenth Shabun, in the year 1294 of the Hegira, for, having myself embraced the Mahometan religion, I use their chronology.

"On the night previous to the battle the whole Russian army, including officers and men, were drunk, and they passed the night in blaspheming, torturing, and killing exactly 11,110 sacred dancing dervishes, 6,760 women, and 13,330 children, two of them twins, whom by a base stratagem they had taken prisoners. Of these 31,200 victims we have ascertained that 3,540 were broken on the wheel, 8,420 had their throats cut, 9,270 were bled to death, 6,310 had all their extremities cut off and were then decapitated, 2,460 were crucified, 620 were impaled, and the remaining 580 were compelled to hang each other, the last man hanging himself.*

"As the Russians are well known to be all cannibals, the bodies of the whole of their victims were eaten by them with evident relish, whilst some of the superior officers kept a few joints of cold dancing dervish, which has a strong gamy flavour, for breakfast next morning, and they quenched their thirst with copious draughts of the blood, drunk out of the skulls of their victims.

"The Turks, on the other hand, spent the eve of the engagement in fasting and prayer, and, after giving a champagne and pâté de foie gras supper to the Russian prisoners whom they had captured, magnanimously liberated them, giving each a new suit

* This took place on a former occasion, when the Swedes invaded Poland.

of clothes, a well-filled purse, and as many Turkish bonds as they could conveniently carry to make into cigarettes, being their customary use in Turkey.

"The Turkish forces were commanded by the Serdar Ekrem Backsheesh* Pasha, supported by the following able generals: Bowstering Pasha, the Muchir Redif Rotoon Biskeet Pasha,† late Minister of War, Chefket Pasha, the hero of Batak, the Pasha of Many Tails,‡ the Egyptian generals, Bloobeerd and Baztynaydoo Pashas, with the El Muddee and Souakim corps, sent with the concurrence of England as a friendly and equitable return for Russia's promise not to attack Egypt, together with the following ex-Christian generals, who had abandoned the Ghiaour creed and had embraced the sublime religion of Mahomet, namely—Grenouille and Gobemouche Pashas, from France, Saur Kraut and Donner-und-Blitzen Pashas, from Germany, Buncombe and Longbow Pashas, from America, and *Penitentiary* Pasha, from England, to whom were added Admiral Paul Jones Filibuster Pasha (who performed such humane and *disinterested* prodigies of valour with the Turkish fleet against the overwhelming forces of the ferocious Cretan traitors); General Sir Hardhold Kannon Ball, Military Commissioner with the Turkish army, who, in strict observance of British neutrality, directed all the operations of the Turkish army; and also Judas Iscariot, and Ananias Effendis, whose duty was to invent Turkish victories and Russian atrocities, and Shylock Effendi, whose mission was to decide whether in any case mercy should be ever extended to a Christian Ghiaour.‖

"The Russian army was commanded by Prince Ruric Romanoffsky, under whose orders were the following generals:—Count Oleg, Baron Vladimir, Alexander Newski, Boris Godonof, Todtle-

* Backsheesh is the Turkish word by which they ask you for a present of money.

† Supposed to be the Turkish adaptation of the nickname he got for making a profit by sending rotten biscuits to the Turkish army when he was paid for sound ones, which caused his removal from the Ministry of War, but did not prevent his getting a command, like Chefket Pasha.

‡ A friend of Captain Marryat's, who wrote the "Pacha of Many Tales."

‖ Ghiaour means infidel *or miscreant*.

ben, Popoff, Jaroslaf, Swiatoslaw, Wsewolod, Rostislaw, Demidoff, Troubetzkoi, Galitzin, Mentschikoff, Ignatieff, Tchnernayeff, Kauffman the Hetman Platoff, and General Mazeppa, commanding the Cossacks.

"During the night a force of 1,010 men was despatched under Achmet Aga, of Batak celebrity, which executed a flank movement and took possession of a ledge inaccessible to the Russians, on the heights immediately behind the Muscovite army, and beyond the range of the Russian rifles.

"Before break of day the Ottoman army advanced noiselessly to a tract of firm ground which is situated in the middle of the morass already mentioned, and which exactly held the whole force, and deployed into line one deep, to give the Russians the idea that their army was double its real number, by which device, I need hardly say, the credulous Russians were completely deceived.

"The Turkish troops, in spite of the enormous disparity of numbers and of guns, and of the almost impregnable position of the Russian army, were, as is invariably the case, confident of victory, and eager to be led against a foe whom they equally despised and hated.

"The Turkish artillery began the attack by a well-directed fire from their 101 guns, which were so well served that, at each discharge, 101 cannon balls entered into a corresponding number of Russian guns, splitting them up and rendering them entirely useless, so that at precisely the tenth volley not one Russian gun remained serviceable. The incredulous reader may, perhaps, inquire what the Russian artillerymen were doing whilst their cannon were being destroyed; but this is easily explained. The 1,010 men on the heights picked off each successive gunner who attempted to load the 1,010 Russian cannon, so that they were unable to fire a single shot.

"On taking up their position in order of battle the Turks, with that chivalry which distinguishes them above all other nations, exclaimed, 'Gentlemen of the Russian army, fire first!' on which exactly 501,999 balls were fired at the Turks, one man having missed fire, who, being six inches beyond the range of the Russian rifles, caught as many of the spent balls as they wanted in their

hands, and then, loading their own rifles with them, discharged them with fatal effect at the Russian army.

"The Russian army was drawn up in a line four deep, and being considerably within the range of the Turkish rifles, which were fired with unerring accuracy by the Ottomans, who had been carefully instructed by William Tell Pasha, each ball passed through the centre of the forehead of the opposing Russian soldier in the front rank, and thence through the skulls of the three men behind him, so that at the first round exactly 199,996 Russians were killed.

"At this appalling slaughter, which was accomplished in 1 minute 33¾ seconds, the Russian army was paralysed with terror, whilst the Turkish army, with incredible enthusiasm and shouts of 'Death to the Ghiaour! Backsheesh to the true believer!' waded through the morass, their heads and rifles only appearing above the surface.

"Meantime the Russian army fired wildly at the advancing foe as soon as they came within range, but as the Turkish skulls are remarkably thick, most of their bullets glanced off as harmlessly as from the hide of a rhinoceros, and, as already explained, the whole of the bodies of the Turks were protected by their being immersed in the morass.

"On the attacking army emerging on the other side, the perpendicular elevation of the Russian position prevented the Muscovites from depressing the muzzles of their rifles sufficiently to bear upon the Turks. The ground on which the Russian army stood being on a concave declivity, the bodies of the slain rolled over the precipice, forming an inclined plane, over which the Turkish army advanced to the attack.

"Meantime the 1,010 men behind the Russian position kept up a continual discharge, whilst they themselves were out of range, killing each time from 1,010 to 4,040 men, according as that part of the Russian army against whom they fired were one to four deep.

"The main Turkish force then scaled the cliffs in front of the Russian position like greased lightning—a feat in comparison

with which the ascent of the heights of Spicheren by the German troops was but child's play.

"Upon this the Russians were suddenly seized with a panic when they saw their resolute aspect, and they could not conceal from themselves the injustice of their cause and the abominable and treasonable ingratitude of their Christian allies who had rebelled against the wisest and most benevolent Government which ever existed since the world began. Not being able to retreat, and being struck with terror and remorse, the whole Russian army surrendered as prisoners, and being overpowered by the bravery, humanity, and magnanimity of the Turks, and convinced, by the miraculous destruction of their cannon by a special interposition of Mahomet—whose spectre was distinctly visible in the air, like that of St. James at Compostella—of the superiority of the Mussulman religion, they immediately became Mahometans and subjects of the Sultan. The Turks, in spite of the cruel massacre of their countrymen on the preceding evening with every refinement of torture, received the Russians as brothers, kissing them repeatedly on both cheeks.

"The total loss of the Russians was 234,567, that of the Turks only 1,234, chiefly drowned in the morass, killed in scaling the heights, or of the fatigue of slaughtering Russians.

"An ambulance, belonging to the Stafford House Committee, was with the Ottoman army, under the direction of Lady Gamp and her friend Mrs. Harris, with Mr. Benjamin Allen and Mr. Bob Sawyer as surgeons, but the Turks would not avail themselves of its services, as they find that it is cheaper to bring over voluntary recruits from Asia in handcuffs,* than to cure their wounded, who are seldom of much use, even when, in spite of the Turkish doctors, they recover; besides, it would be cruel to retard their arrival at the pavilions of the houris.

"An enormous number of Russian soldiers and officers were weltering in their blood; but as they had received strict orders from the very humane members of the committee not to assist the Russian vermin under any circumstances, who being, like fish,

* These 1,500 recruits were driven to Jaffa, manacled together in files of ten to twenty.—*Times, 14th July.*

cold-blooded creatures, are insensible to pain, and consider bleeding to death a luxury, they left them to their fate.

"After Lady Gamp had relieved her ill humour by scolding the nurses, the officials of the ambulance, having nothing better to do, sat down to a sumptuous luncheon, prepared by their French cook, consisting of all the delicacies in or out of season, and some remarkably choice Chateau Yquem at only 50 francs a bottle, and passed a most agreeable day.

"The Turkish rulers, unlike the superstitious governments of infidel countries like England and France, do not consider it necessary or expedient to have a staff of imaums to give their dying soldiers the last consolations of religion individually, but a dancing dervish accompanies each army, and dances a species of tarantella after each battle, from which the Turkish wounded are said to derive great spiritual benefit, so that death becomes a positive pleasure. Some Roman Catholic Bosniacs being among the mortally wounded on the Turkish side, as there were no Romish priests to give them the last sacrament, and as their spiritual guides had informed them before leaving home that the Russo-Greek priests were imps of Satan, and that the Mahometan religion much more nearly resembled the Romish faith than that of the Greek Church, eagerly sought and received the ministrations of the dancing dervish, who extemporized a new step on the occasion, which gave the dying men infinite comfort and smoothed their passage to eternity.

"The 113 armed civilian Turks of Katsh-Tartar Bazardjik, thus fighting by Bashi Bazouks and other deputies for their hearths and homes, which they had now rescued from all fear of destruction, gave a gentle hint to the 1,130 unarmed Christian inhabitants by bastinadoing them all, and by afterwards politely inviting them to set fire to their houses and to sign a declaration that they had done this voluntarily as an expiation of their enormous crimes in rebelling, neglecting to pay treble taxes, and daring to prevent the friendly visits of the Bashi Bazouks to their houses, and their attentions to their wives, daughters, and *good-looking sons*.

"The Turkish army thus reinforced is in full march for Moscow and St. Petersburg.

"I myself counted the respective armies, the victims massacred by the Russians, and the killed, wounded, missing, and prisoners, and I can, therefore, vouch for the absolute accuracy of my figures.

"In a short time I expect to announce to your readers the capture of Moscow and St. Petersburg, the annexation of Russia to the Ottoman dominions, and the conversion of the whole Russian nation from the errors of Christianity to the true religion of Mahomet.

"P.S. (private) To the Editor. Please say if my telegram was spicy enough, or whether your readers would relish a little more 'blood and thunder,' and let me know the profits of the special edition containing my telegram. You really ought to give me a percentage.

"It was too bad of the correspondent of the *Times* to say that a brother correspondent (evidently alluding to me) had agreed to sign and transmit any telegrams or letters on the subject of Russian atrocities which the Turkish officials might invent, on condition that he obtained earlier and more authentic intelligence of the events of the war than other correspondents, for hawks, according to the proverb, should not pick out hawks' eyes. However, I suppose all is fair in love and war, and if I had not made this bargain you could not have had the astounding and thrilling information contained in this telegram, which you will find will appear in no other journal.

"After all, my telegram, I must admit, is very tame indeed in comparison with some which have already appeared in the *Blood and Thunder Gazette.*"

AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE UTTER IMPOSSIBILITY OF PERSUADING ENGLISHMEN TO BELIEVE ANYTHING CONTRARY TO THEIR PRECONCEIVED NOTIONS.

ALL English-speaking people but geographers firmly believe that John O'Groat's House is the most northern point on the mainland of Great Britain, but the fact is, as every map that has ever been published of the British Isles clearly shows, that Dunnet Head is considerably further north; consequently, hundreds of tourists annually proceed, at considerable expense, to visit John O'Groat's House, but hardly a single individual ever visits Dunnet Head, and what renders this more surprising is that Dunnet Head, besides being easier of access, is a lofty and noble promontory with cliffs descending almost perpendicularly to the sea, whilst at John O'Groat's House there is nothing whatever to be seen but low sand-hills, and not a vestige of the house which every one comes to see is to be found—indeed, for my part, I do not believe that any such house ever existed.

Even their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, and General Grant, the Ex-President of the American Republic, when they did me the honour of visiting me at Thurso Castle, would not take my advice to visit Dunnet Head instead of John O'Groat's, and could hardly be persuaded that the former was further north than the latter; and probably few Englishmen would venture to confess that they had visited Dunnet Head and had omitted John O'Groat's, any more than they would own that they had visited Egypt without seeing the

Pyramids; and as long as the world endures the vulgar error will last that Great Britain extends from the Land's End to John O'Groat's, instead of, as is the fact, from the Land's End to the Land's Beginning (Dunnet Head).

If, in a matter which does not involve "British interests," national pride, or any other influence or feeling whatever, we so absurdly adhere to a palpable and obvious error, no one need be surprised that Englishmen cling to the equally erroneous and equally general idea that Turkey has been always the ally of England, and Russia has been our constant foe; for I proved from historical facts and statements by eminent men the diametrical opposite in my speech in the House of Commons. As soon as I sat down, member after member rose up to repeat the misstatements which I had so clearly and fully refuted, and, whilst I was listened to with impatience and incredulity, they were applauded to the echo.

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND AUTHORITIES QUOTED IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY OCCUR.

1 Comte Seebach
2 Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P.
3 Lord Beaconsfield
4 Talleyrand
5 The *World*
6 Lord Byron
7 Lord Sandon, M.P.
8 Mr. Courtney, M.P.
9 Mr. Cross, M.P.
10 Mr. Baxter, M.P.
11 Sir Robert Peel, M.P.
12 Mr. Foster, M.P.
13 Mr. Bourke, M.P.
14 Lord Elcho, M.P.
15 Major O'Gorman, M.P.
16 Dr. Kenealy, M.P.
17 Mr. Gladstone, M.P.
18 The *Times*
19 Colonel Vincent
20 Schuyler
21 Maghan
22 Chinese Envoy
23 Jefferson
24 Mirabeau's brother
25 The Duke of Wellington
26 Lord John Russell
27 The Emperor Nicholas
28 Lord Aberdeen
29 Herr Von Vincke
30 Kinglake
31 Napoleon III.
32 Count Nesselrode
33 Count Buol
34 Lord Grey
35 The *Allgemeine Zeitung*
36 Rushdi Pasha, late Grand Vizier
37 Midhat Pasha, late Grand Vizier
38 Rifaat Bey
39 Abedin Bey
40 Sir George Campbell, M.P.
41 Lady Duff Gordon
42 Author of Secret Dispatches of General Ignatieff
43 Mr. Mackenzie Wallace
44 Consul Holmes
45 Musurus Pasha
46 Montesquieu
47 Count Andrassy
48 The Turkish Commissioners
49 The *Daily News*
50 Mr. Baring
51 The Berlin Memorandum
52 Lord Derby

53 Prince Milan
54 Sir Henry Elliott
55 Prince Gortschakoff
56 Safvet Pasha
57 The Czar Alexander
58 Lord Stratford de Redcliffe
59 The Emperor of Germany
60 M. Melegari
61 Edhem Pasha
62 Sultan Hamid
63 Count Schouvaloff
64 Mr. Jocelyn
65 Lord A. Loftus
66 The Duke of Rutland
67 La Rochefoucauld
68 The *Grajdavine* of St. Petersburg
69 Sir W. Vernon Harcourt, M.P.
70 Mr. Freeman
71 Prince Bismarck
72 M. Tisza
73 Mr. Augustus Sala
74 Sydney Smith
75 Mr. Sandford, M.P.
76 Mr. Forsyth, M.P.
77 Ockley's "History of the Saracens"
78 Tacitus
79 Tom Moore
80 Mahomet
81 Wilkes
82 Omar
83 Alison
84 M. de Tchitchatchef
85 Mahomet II.
86 Lady Verney
87 Lord Holland
88 Edmund Burke [ton)
89 Mr. Hobhouse (Lord Brough-
90 Sir James Mackintosh
91 Mr. Peel (afterwards Sir Robert)
92 Lord Raglan
93 The Duke of Newcastle
94 Mr. Denton
95 Colonel Baker
96 The Duke of Argyll
97 Lord Hartington
98 The Earl of Dudley
99 The Marquis of Bath
100 Mr. Evans [M.P.
101 Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice,
102 Mr. Holms, M.P.
103 Vice-Consul Dupuis
104 Mr. Cobden
105 Mehemet Kuprisli Pasha
106 Captain Ward
107 Mr. Barkley, C.E.
108 Achmed Veofic Effendi
109 Mr. Senior
110 Vice-Consul Blunt
111 Consul Monson
112 M. Ristich
113 Consul Reade
114 Consul Brophy
115 Consul Calvert
116 General Sir Fenwick Williams, of Kars
117 Colonel Horvatovitch
118 Mr. Cooper
119 Lady Mary Wortley Mon-
120 Fuad Pasha [tague
121 Mr. Layard
122 Sir Henry Bulwer (Lord Dalling)
123 Prince Nicholas of Montenegro
124 Colonel Thömmel
125 Mrs. Thistlethwayte
126 Comte de Maistre

127 Lord Brougham
128 Admiral Griffin
129 Mr. Luttrell
130 Macaulay
131 Mr. Parnell, M.P.
132 Mr. O'Neill Daunt
133 Dr. Leland
134 Carter
135 Lord Clarendon
136 Charles II.
137 William III.
138 Lord Gosford
139 Lord Moira
140 Smollett
141 The *Saturday Review*
142 Thackeray
143 Mr. Urquhart, M.P.
144 Voltaire
145 Lord Chatham
146 Mr. Pitt
147 Fox
148 Lord North
149 Lord Aberdeen
150 Lord Palmerston (late)
151 Lord Carnarvon (late)
152 Mr. Dunlop
153 Sir Alexander Burnes
154 Mr. Kaye
155 Sir Herbert Edwardes
156 Mr. Bright
157 Hadji Pasha
158 Mr. Douglas Freshfield
159 Adam Oleasius
160 Klaproth
161 Laurence Oliphant
162 Lieutenant Royer
163 *Harper's Illustrated Journal* (New York)
164 Dr. Rieger
165 Lord Salisbury
166 M. Theodore Juste
167 Lesur
168 Gaillardet
169 Chevalier d'Eon
170 Peter the Great
171 Mr. Lowe, M.P.
172 Carlyle
173 Heine
174 De Tocqueville
175 The Czar Alexander I.
176 Lempriere's "Classical Dictionary"
177 The *Figaro*
178 M. F. Martens
179 Mr. Horsman
180 Casimir V. of Poland
181 Madame de Motteville
182 Baron de Worms
183 M. Thiers
184 Odysseus
185 Mr. Scarlett (afterwards Lord Abinger)
186 The *New York Times*
187 Adolphus Slade
188 Thornton's "Turkey"
189 Mathieu's "La Turquie"
190 Eton's "Turkey"
191 Mr. Macfarlane's "Kismet"
192 M. Cousiniery (Voyage dans le Macedoine)
193 Colonel Mansfield
194 General Comte Kotzebue
195 Count Valerian Krasinski
196 The *Tablet*
197 Sir James Stephen
198 Mr. Laing, M.P.
199 Lord Hardinge
200 General Scott
201 Mr. Baillie
202 *Truth*

203 Dr. Birdwood
204 Professor Monier Williams
205 Mr. Ashbury, M.P.
206 The Attorney-General
207 "Statesman's Year Book"
208 Lord Carnarvon
209 Mr. G. J. Holyoake
210 The *Scotsman*
211 *Ost Preussiche Zeitung*
212 *Daily Review*
213 *Cologne Gazette*
214 *Londoner Zeitung*
215 *Kreuz Zeitung*
216 Mrs. Garrett Fawcett
217 Lord Granville
218 *Le Nord*
219 *La Gazette de Moscou*
220 *Morning Advertiser*
221 *Daily Telegraph*
222 *La Revue des Deux Mondes*
223 M. Leroy Beaulieu
224 M. de Latacaz
225 *Punch*
226 *Nord Deutsche Zeitung*
227 *Annual Register*
228 "Statesman's Year Book"
229 Hansard's "Parliamentary Debates"
230 Mr. Auberon Herbert
231 Lamartine
232 Mr. Stephens
233 Eliot Warburton
234 Mr. Walsh
235 Mr. Spencer
236 Mr. Crowe
237 Bayle St. John
238 M. Blanqui
239 Earl of Carlisle
240 Rev. H. Southgate
241 Dr. Acton
242 Miss Martineau
243 Mr. Layard
244 Consul Saunders
245 Consul Baratti
246 Consul Neale
247 Dr. Sandwith
248 Rev. C. Hawkins
249 Miss Irby
250 Captain Burton
251 Mr. Barkley
252 Mr. Evans
253 Sir G. Campbell
254 Swiderski
255 Gibbon
256 *Almanac de Gotha*
257 Mr. G. Warriner
258 Mr. Goschen
259 Lord R. Montagu
260 Captain Marryat
261 The Bible
262 The Mishna
263 Maimonides
264 Bortenova
265 Mr. Innes
266 Tacitus
267 Charles Dickens
268 *Moniteur Roumain*
269 M. Golesco
270 M. Boeresco
271 Vice-Consul St. John
272 Consul-General Green
273 M. Cogalniceano
274 Adolphe Vaimberg
275 Israelitish notables of Jassy
276 M. Manuel
277 M. Bratiano
278 M. Mititsch
279 *Kladderadatsch*
280 G. Augustus Sala
281 Sir John Cowell Stepney

INDEX TO PART II.

AMERICANS, their dislike of the Jews, 133

BEACONSFIELD, Earl of, Count Seebach's "open letter" to, 42. Letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Count Seebach's charges, 50

Blood and Thunder Gazette, its description of the "great battle of Katsch-Tartar Bazardjik," 241

Bright, Mr., on the Eastern Question, 24

Bulgaria, *Truth* on the "king" and "queen" of, 229

Bulgarian atrocities, Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the, 84

Daily News, on the Russian and Turkish atrocities, 75, 85. Its correspondents at the seat of war, 88. On the position of the Jews in the East, 131

Daily Telegraph and the alleged Russian atrocities, 71, 72, 74

Debate on the Eastern Question, curious and comic incidents of the, 1. "Catching the Speaker's eye," 2, 3. Speeches of Mr. Courtney, 3; Dr. Kenealy, 4, 7; Mr. Cross, 4; Lord Sandon, 5; Mr. Baxter, 5; Sir Robert Peel, 5; Mr. Bourke, 6; Lord Elcho, 6; Major O'Gorman, 7; and Mr. Gladstone, 8

"Diary of my Ride to Khiva," extracts from *Punch*, 66

Dickens, Charles, his photograph of an M.P., 231

EASTERN Question, the debate on the, 1. Mr. Gladstone's speech in the debate, 8. Mr. Bright on the, 24. Professor Martens on the, 176

England's policy in the East, the Jew's notion of, 113

"England's policy in the East," by Baron Henry de Worms, some remarks on, 98. Description of its contents, 99. Its ridiculous errors and exaggerations, 100, 102. Its abuse of the Russians, 103. Inaccuracy of its statistics, 104. Opinions of the press on, 105

FORBES, MR. ARCHIBALD, his dispatch on the crossing of the Danube, 88

"Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question," by Lord R. Montagu, criticism of, 108, 111

Franco-German War, correspondence of Sir J. G. T. Sinclair on the mismanagement of the English aid to the sick and wounded, 192, 202, 210, 220. The *Morning Advertiser* on Sir G. T. Sinclair's correspondence, 221; and reply of Mr. George Warriner to his criticisms and suggestions in the *Times*, 226

Freeman, Mr., extracts from his "Ottoman power in Europe," 36

GLADSTONE, Mr., part of his speech in the debate on the Eastern Question, 8. Remarks on Russian deeds in Turkistan, 13

INDIVIDUALS, and authorities quoted in this work, list of, 249

Interview between an Englishman and a Turkish Pasha, sketch by Kinglake, 57

JEWS, the, and the newspaper press, 112, Mr. Worms' computation of their numbers in the Russian Empire, 113. Sketch of their national career, 114, 129. Present number of, in the United Kingdom, 129. Ties which unite the Jews and Turks, 291. Included in the Rusian conscription, 129.

Our foreign loans brought out by, 130. Mock auctions and lock-outs, 130. Charles Dickens's Fagin, 130. Contempt of Spinosa and Heine for Judaism, 131. *Daily News*, on their position in the East, 131. A most undesirable element in the population, 132. The Talmudists and the congregation of British Jews, 133. Dislike of the Americans to, 133. Their banishment from England, 135. The Jewish money-lender, 135. Their disregard of the Mosaic law, 136. Not allowed to sit in Parliament till 1860, 136. Tacitus on their character, 137. Their alleged ill-treatment in Roumania and Servia, 137, 153. Their filthy habits, 142. Their barbarous condition in Roumania, 147. Letter of M. Manuel on their persecution by the Mahometans, 148. M. Matitsch on the Jews in Servia, 149. M. Boeresco on the sale of spirituous liquors by the Jews, 151

Jews, sketch of their career from the earliest period to the present time, 114, 129. Incidents in their history from the book of Genesis, 114, 115. The exodus from Egypt, 115. Their disregard of the ceremonial law, 116, 117. Their wars of extermination, 118. Their barbarities to their own countrymen, 118. The Levite and his concubine, 118. The massacre of the Benjamites by the Israelites, 119. Their idolatry, 120. Jephthah's vow, 120. Jael's treachery, 120. David and Uriah, 120. Solomon's proverbs, 120, and doubtful wisdom, 120. Solomon's opinion of the Jews, 121, *note*. Abijah's slaughter of the Israelites, 121. Their conduct to our Saviour, 121. The trial of Jesus a mockery of justice, 123. The crucifixion, 124. Gibbon on the Jews of the middle ages, 125, 127; and their horrible massacres in Cyprus and Cyrene, 127. Their savage ferocity in modern times, 128. The murder of the Patriarch Gregory, 128. Their defeat of the Greeks at Navacta, 128.

Jews, their alleged ill-treatment in Roumania and Servia, Government blue-book on, 137. Dispatches of Vice-Consul St. John, 137, 139, 140, 152; of M. Cogalniceano, 142. Letter of the President of the Israelitish community at Bucharest, 145. Address of the Israelite notables of Jassy, 146. Extract from the *Moniteur Roumain*, 150

Karapapaks, the, 79

Kemball, Sir Arnold, his disgraceful and insulting treatment by the Turks, 87

Kinglake, sketch of an interview between an Englishman and a Turkish Pasha, 57

Manners in the East, sketch by Thackeray, 62

Martens, Professor, on the Eastern Question, 176

Montagu, Lord R., his "Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question," criticism of, 108—111

Montenegrins, their treatment of Turkish prisoners, 84

M.P., photograph of an, by Charles Dickens, 231

Murder, punishment of, in Turkey, 75

National Society for the Aid of the Wounded in War, the, 181. Letter of Mr. Auberon Herbert to the *Times* on the conduct of the Committee, 181. Unequal distribution of its supplies, 184. Deputation to, 185. Reply of Colonel Loyd-Lindsay to the deputation, 185. The purchase of stores, 187. How to prevent the misappropriation of stores, 188. Willingness of Russia to receive its aid, 191. The author's experience of its working during the Franco-German War, 188—192

National Society for the Aid of the Wounded in War and the Stafford House Committee, 181

Northcote, Sir Stafford, letter on Lord Beaconsfield and Count Seebach, 50

Opinions on Turkey by travellers of various nationalities:—M. de Lamartine, 155. Mr. J. L. Stephens, the American traveller, 155. Mr. Eliot Warburton, 156. Mr. Walsh, 156. Mr. Thackeray, 156. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, 156. M. Guizot, 156. M. de Tocqueville, 157. Mr. Spencer, 157, 159. Mr. Crowe, 157, 160, 163. Mr. Bayle St. John, 158. M. Blanqui, 158. The Earl of Carlisle, 159. The Rev. Horatio Southgate, 160. The author of "Eöthen," 161. Dr. Aiton, 161. Miss Martineau, 162. Mr. Layard, 162, 163. Mr. McCulloch, 164. Colonel Saunders, 164. Vice-Consul Baratti, 164. Consul Neale, 164. Consul Saunders, 164. The author of "Ex-

periences of an English Sister of Mercy," 165. Dr. Sandwith, 165, 166. Letter to the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, 168—170. Miss Irby, 171. Captain Warren, 171. Captain Burton, 172. Mr. Henry C. Barkley, 173. Mr. Evans, 174. Sir George Campbell, 174

PHOTOGRAPH of an M.P., by Charles Dickens, 231

Punch, Mr. Burnand's "Diary of my Ride to Khiva," 66. On alleged Russian atrocities, 68

RUSSIAN atrocities, the alleged, a few remarks on, 71. In Turkistan, 13. *Punch* on, 68. Aarifi Pasha's statistics, 71. The *Daily Telegraph's* sensational reports, 71, 74. Points which should be established, 73. Statements of twenty representatives of the Press, 73. The Parliamentary paper on, 74. Extracts from the *Times*, 76—80, 86, 89; the *Daily News*, 75, 85; *Le Temps*, 80; the *Stamboul*, 78; the *Cologne Gazette*, 79; and the *XIXme Siècle*, 90. Mr. Layard and Safket Pasha inconsistencies in their reports, 81, 82. Extracts from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, 84.

Russian deeds in Turkistan, Mr. Gladstone on, 13

Russian navy, heroism of the, 77

Russians, their care of the wounded, 185

Russo-Turkish war, Turkish soldiers distrusted by their generals, 76. Turkish treachery, 76, 90. Humane treatment of Turkish prisoners by the Russians, 77, 83, 85, 92. Discipline of the Russian troops, 79, 85. Barbarous treatment of Russian prisoners by the Turks, 81, 92. Incapacity and laziness of Turkish generals, 83. Amenities of newspaper correspondents, 88, 89. Letter to the *Daily Telegraph*, by Sir J. G. T. Sinclair, on English intervention, 225

SEEBACH, COUNT, and the Earl of Beaconsfield, letters to the *Nord*, 42, 54; to the *Daily News*, 47, 50, and 51, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, 50. Article from the *World*, 55

Seebach, Count, translation of his "open letter" to Lord Beaconsfield, 42. Translation of his rejoinder to Lord Beaconsfield's reply, 54

Shipka Pass, abandonment of positions by the Turks, 73. Treachery of the Turks, 76. Turkish atrocities on the Russian wounded, 89

Sick and Wounded Russian and Montenegrin Soldiers' Relief Fund, 188

Sinclair, Sir J. G. Tollemache, Bart., M.P., letters to the *Daily News* on Count Seebach's charges against Lord Beaconsfield, 47, 51. His correspondence on the working of the National Society in Aid of the Wounded during the Franco-German war, in the *Times*, 191, 210, 220; in the *Morning Advertiser*, 202; in the *Daily Telegraph*, 224. On English intervention in the Russo-Turkish war, 224. Article in the *Morning Advertiser* on his letters during the Franco-German war, 221. Opinions of the *Cologne Gazette* on his correspondence, 210. Reply of Mr. George Warriner, 226

Stafford House Fund, the committee open to censure for confining their operations to the Turks, 184. *Truth* on Lady Strangford and the, 229

Stamboul, suspension of the, for exposing a fabricated report of alleged Russian cruelties, 78

THACKERAY, sketch of manners in the East, 62

"The Buckinghamshire Buffoon" (Lord Beaconsfield), political squib from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 178

"The great battle of Katsch-Tartar Bazardjik," description of, in the *Blood and Thunder Gazette*, 241

"The Jews the implacable foes of the Christians," 112

Times, the, on Russian and Turkish atrocities, 76, 77, 78, 86, 90, 92. Interception and alteration of its correspondent's telegrams, 93, 95.

Turcos, cruelty of, in the Franco-German war, 72

Turkish army, recruiting for the, how managed, 97

Turkish atrocities, description of, by the *Times*, 76, 92; by General Tchernayeff, 81; by the *Cologne Gazette*, 97

Turkistan, Mr. Gladstone on Russian deeds in, 13

Turks, their treatment of the wounded, 185

"VESTA," the, her combat with an ironclad, 78

WALLACE'S "Russia," extract from, 31.

World, the, on Count Seebach's charges against Lord Beaconsfield, 55.

WORMS, Baron Henry de, some remarks on his book, "England's Policy in the East," 98.

OPINIONS ON SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR'S PUBLICATIONS.

FROM THE "DAILY REVIEW."

THE member for Caithness has been to the war, looking at it from a political point of view, seeing matters for himself, and has come home with a bundle of opinions about it so extremely emphatic that it is highly interesting to examine them in detail. There is a quality about Sir J. T. Sinclair's letter which is not to be found everywhere among either official or non-official documents about the war, the quality of rude, hard-hitting common sense. Sir John is a violent partisan, and yet he makes a terribly good case for his friends the Germans. He rather out-Bismarcks Bismarck in one or two points. A "neutral partisan," to use an Irishism, is generally more strong in his statement of affairs than either of the belligerent parties. Count Bismarck wishes to leave open some loophole for peace; Sir John Sinclair states the German case so very emphatically and so very inexorably that we doubt whether any peace could be got, short of actual ruin to France, were he Prime Minister of Germany.

Gambetta means well, but he is deceiving both himself and the people at present. Sir John Sinclair's letter, though in places exaggerated, is far nearer the truth than Gambetta's proclamations; yet if this letter was translated into French, the French would probably vote it to be "the letter of an English citizen in a state of distraction." They would, had they the power, probably hang Sir John Sinclair first, and examine his letter afterwards. For our part, we were rather glad that this very plain-spoken gentleman got through the debatable ground on the border in safety to Luxembourg. He was in great danger; and had there been a precedent for shooting a member of Parliament of an allied nation, Sir John Sinclair would have been the man. Scarcely a man has a better right to speak than

he, and we only regret that such a very able letter should show in places a little more bias than we care to see from a man in his position.

The French have made a hideous mistake, a mistake which, were the Prussians expelled from France in three months from now, could not be put right in the lifetime of the present generation. We think that Sir John Sinclair, knowing as he does that the letter he has written will be sooner or later sent to each of the French journals, has been too hard on the French. It may be said that he can prove his accusation against them. We do not doubt that, but there is a time for mercy as there is a time for judgment.

It seems to us that Sir John Sinclair's friends should very much moderate their terms if they mean to have a peace without exhausting and paralyzing themselves as much as they do their enemies. A fortnight will either add to German demands, or will reduce them by one-half. In the meantime we can most heartily thank Sir John Sinclair for his deeply interesting though one-sided letter.

TRANSLATED FROM "KREUZ ZEITUNG."

THE opinion of the English newspapers of the conduct of the war is shown by the appearance in the *Times* of an article by Sir Tollemache Sinclair, who, after a considerable stay with the German army, has just returned to England. Although we cannot give the article (which, from the originality of its ideas, and the evident effort to be impartial, may be interesting in Germany), we shall extract some of the most important passages, as well as some others, which demand more than a word of observation. After Sir Tollemache Sinclair has strikingly pourtrayed the moderation shown by the Germans, as contrasted with the insolence of the French with regard to the conditions of peace, as hitherto debated, he goes on to say that after the taking of Paris public opinion in Germany will make higher demands than before of the conquered.

With praiseworthy (decision) Sir Tollemache Sinclair turns, in the following paragraph, upon the English, showing their leaning towards France and against Germany. He cannot conceal his astonishment that there are persons who do not understand that in France all parties eagerly desired war with England. The sum of his conclusion on this point he puts in the significant sentence—"That every killed or wounded German has saved an Englishman from a similar fate, and that in this war Germany fights as much for England as for herself."

As he goes on with great sharpness to criticize the conduct of the war by the French (those "Greeks of the West"), Sir Tollemache Sinclair's friendly feeling towards Germany makes itself constantly apparent.

We add, finally, as most significant, the following very sensible proposals:—The writer wishes that, to encourage France in the cession of the forfeited German territory, England should, on her part, set her a good example, by giving up, in the same way as she freely resigned the Ionian Islands to Greece—the Island of Heligoland—useless to her, and a gift which would be gladly accepted by Germany, and thus efface all dissatisfaction at England's attitude towards her. Now, we are sure that our Englishman deceives himself as little here as in his opinion of our army, and it is only to be desired that on the other side of the Channel there were more men like him.

FROM THE "OST PREUSSICHE ZEITUNG."

AMONG these writers of communicated letters, one of the most zealous champions for Germany—her rights and her claims—is the member of Parliament, Sir Tollemache Sinclair. He is acquainted with Germany—travelled through it before the war—and since it commenced visited the fields of battle and ambulances after the battle of Sedan, and upon these he has written valuable, because unexaggerated, reports. His repeated and detailed letters to the *Times*, *Morning Advertiser*, and other newspapers, have appeared on the side of Germany, against her English opponents and their charges, and has especially maintained her right to the re-acquisition of Alsace and German-Lorraine. In one of his most recent letters he acutely answers the objections made to the annexation of a pretendedly unwilling people, by referring to the proceedings of nearly every other Power.

FROM THE "KOLNISCHE ZEITUNG."

AN English M.P., Sir Tollemache Sinclair, of Thurso Castle, who has several times visited the seat of war, has sent two comprehensive articles to the *Times*, which combine the most praiseworthy impartiality with the justest apprehension of the position of affairs, and prove in the most gratifying way that the thoughtful and well-informed Englishmen consider the cause of Germany to be the right one throughout.

Sir Tollemache Sinclair depicts in a singularly clear and

thoroughly truthful manner the disgraceful and false bearing of the French and the manly and upright behaviour of the Germans, on whose side he agrees throughout, so that it is easy to see that he visited the seat of war as an attentive observer.

We have entered somewhat fully on this article, because it must make a very good impression in England, when experienced men—members of Parliament—declare themselves so openly on the side of Germany. Such articles do honour to the English nation, and enable us to hope that the English Government itself will take the right course.

THIERS, and still more the military writers, will tell you how many thousands the Emperor had in hospital at the end of every campaign, and how much his garrisons were weakened even in time of peace. In the battles to be wounded at all severely was to die. The surgeons were not over skilful; they were even less remarkable for humanity. Officers of rank were well attended to, but the spirit of benevolence was not yet sufficiently active for the soldier to be cared for as a man and a brother—as something more than a pawn on the chessboard of war. Among the civil population there was little or no interest in the work of the hospital. The people were gratified by victory; they had a vague pity for their soldiers under disaster; but it needs education and moral refinement to make people feel acutely even the sufferings they witness. Erckmann-Chatrian tells us how little pity the peasants used to show for the wounded soldiers, their own countrymen. The same phenomenon is noticed in the present war. Sir Tollemache Sinclair described yesterday the indifference with which the French bystanders, and even their unwounded comrades, witnessed the sufferings of the wounded, and it would seem that the imagination and sentiment which education gives are necessary for a quick sympathy with suffering. In the old wars the soldier, looked upon by Prince, by General, and by society as a kind of public gladiator, who must be killed or die sooner or later, went to his fate with recklessness, and whole levies of conscripts disappeared, to be succeeded by others as a matter of course.—*Times.*

TRANSLATED FROM "LONDONER ZEITUNG."

SIR J. G. TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR, one of the best informed persons on Continental matters in this country, writes to the *Times* as follows:—"Had I gone to the theatre of war as an ardent

admirer of France, I must have returned an enthusiastic partizan of Germany, after having had an opportunity of comparing the noble bearing of this brave nation with the despicable deeds of the French." It is very agreeable to find in this country, where so few persons understand Continental politics, some highly-cultivated individuals who with great insight defend the rights of Germany.

FROM PRINCE BISMARCK.

Versailles, 1st July, 1871.

SIR,—Your esteemed letter, which I have read with lively interest, unfortunately came to hand at a moment when the state of my health forbade me any but indispensable labour, so that for a period of six weeks I was obliged to abstain from the most urgent business.

Now that I have been able to read your publication, I have learnt with lively satisfaction that you, in England, are spreading the ideas which the German people consider to be just and right. If I have not earlier thanked you for this, I beg you to believe that the delay has only arisen from circumstances which were beyond my control.

Accept, sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Signed, V. BISMARCK.

ON WORK ON THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE London correspondent of the *Birmingham Weekly Post* (Mr. George Holyoake) says:—"Good books upon the House of Commons are rare. One of the Palgraves a short time ago published a clever lecture, in its way, upon the 'History and Manners of Parliament,' but Sir Tollemache Sinclair has very much surpassed this latter production in a very clever 'Glance at the House of Commons,' which he took in a lecture probably delivered to his constituents in Caithness. There is an air of clever and amusing candour about it—there is a calculating recklessness in the style which is quite refreshing. The speaker appears to dash off his ideas, but when the phrases have entertained the reader there is found to be good sound judgment in them. He describes the architecture of the House, the outside and the in, the entrances and lobbies, the division lobbies, the order of business, the incidents and oratory of the House, and one section is devoted to Sir Tollemache's own speeches—and it is very rarely that one meets with a passage of more original and creditable egotism. Sir Tollemache has the rare gift which an illustrious countryman of his so much desired, that of seeing himself as others see him; but he is worth seeing and hearing for his own sake, and the account he gives of himself is as amusing as it is modest. He thinks it likely his lecture may not be read; but if the nature and contents of it were known, I venture to say that a very large edition would be bought of a small pamphlet which gives more information of the manners, customs, and oratory of the House of Commons than anybody else has given within the same compass. The lecturer had an ancestor, Sir George Sinclair, of Clyth, who represented Caithness in several Parliaments. Sir Tollemache's father was himself unsuccessful in Parliament.

He often told his son that, if he had to begin life again, no consideration would induce him to represent a constituency. It is fortunate his son has not grown up of the same opinion, or the public would never have had the charming little glance at the House to which I have referred."

On Publications on the Eastern Question. From the "Nord" Newspaper.

"THE two remarkable letters of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, member of the English Parliament—letters which appeared at first in the *Scotsman*, and which we reproduced last week—have caused in Russia an impression so much the more lively since one is so little accustomed to meet in the English press opinions so impartial on the politics of Russia in the East. 'How can one explain to oneself,' inquires the *Moscow Gazette*, on this occasion, 'that a person who is known should choose a provincial newspaper in which to publish his opinions? Must one really admit that even a member of Parliament cannot obtain insertion in an influential journal of anything favourable to Russia? That is, however, the case. We know from an unimpeachable source (adds the *Moscow Gazette*) that the London journals persistently refuse the publication of communications the tenor of which diverges from the ideas and the views which dominate in Governmental spheres. There is more than this. The speeches pronounced in Parliament, if they are in sympathy with Russia and with the Eastern Christians, find no place in the newspapers. They are abridged to such an extent as to lose all their vigour, and often even their meaning."*

"Perhaps our colleague of Moscow goes a little too far when he reproaches the London journal for not accepting communications at variance with the ideas and the views which predominate in Ministerial regions. The *Times* and the *Daily News* have sometimes published letters respecting which they must have been more annoyed than satisfied in Governmental circles. But it is consequently only the more surprising that these journals have shut their columns to the two letters of Sir J. Tollemache Sinclair, which, by the interesting historical views which they furnish, and the ability with which all the various elements of the Eastern problem are therein found condensed, largely merited being welcomed there, even leaving out of account the position occupied by their author, and the generous hospitality accorded by the *Times* to preceding communications due to the same pen. It is that this honourable member of Parliament has stretched out a sacrilegious hand against a prejudice which the *Times* and its brethren of London will not tolerate doubtless to be touched; he has shown by historical facts that the pretended ardent desire of Russia to establish itself at Constantinople is a pure fable; he has recalled the fact that the Russians occupied Constantinople in 1833, and that it only depended on them to remain there. Before such palpable material proof, how could any one sustain the theory which is in such honour in the English press, and in almost the whole Continental press? It is much easier not to publish these facts, in order to be able to continue to descant at your ease on phantasms which they destroy. This is evidently what the *Times* has thought, and it is therefore, doubtless, why it refused to publish the letters of Sir T. Sinclair."

* Such as that of Colonel Mure, who had promised the Christians to represent their grievances, and could not get the House to listen or the newspapers to report him.

OPINIONS ON SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR'S PUBLICATIONS.

FROM THE "NORD DEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG," OF BERLIN.

August 28, 1877.

Sir T. SINCLAIR is known since 1870 to the German press through his unceasing efforts during the war to influence his countrymen in favour of the German cause. By speech and writing Sir T. Sinclair stood up for the justice of the Germans in warding off the French attacks, and for the fairness of the German offers of peace. He has not only displayed a very stirring activity on the subject of the care of the wounded, but found leisure to bring in numerous articles from the leading English and foreign papers in favour of Germany against the attacks and falsehoods of that portion of the press who were hostile to us. His activity was recognized by letters of thanks from Prince Bismarck, from Versailles, and in the following year he received a letter from Field-Marshal Count Moltke. Sir T. Sinclair is now occupied on a book, and in a few days we shall hear his views in favour of a reconstruction of the Greek Empire. Sir T. Sinclair here tells his countrymen something hardly agreeable to them. Had they only to choose between a Russian and a Greek Mediterranean fleet, they would choose the latter as the lesser evil; but in thereby quieting this Power they would certainly displease every other maritime Power which comes near the English on the way between Gibraltar and Suez. And with the growth of Greece there would be also a growth of its naval power, its maritime importance, and also an increase of Greek commerce and Greek influence on the east coast of the Mediterranean. We do not know if it would be possible for the English to satisfy themselves with these ideas.

When Sir J. G. T. Sinclair began, he not only had a claim to the consideration of the Germans, who remember with pleasure their debt of gratitude to him, without at the same time endorsing in their full extent his political opinions in regard to Greece, but he can also recall, in opposition to the opinions of his countrymen, the Iron Duke, the Duke of Wellington, who fifty years ago had another Greece in view than that which had too nobly struggled again to be subdued, but which was finally deemed too small to form a powerful active State with a mission as bearer of civilization into the East.

So far, no one could treat the subject with more warmth and eloquence than Sir T. Sinclair. The many political and unpolitical heads in Europe, whom the present war alarms, because they fear the very improbable aggrandisement of Russia, will find in the conclusions of the Scotch baronet the most fitting way for their own tranquillity, and therefore they will probably be strongly supported.

OPINIONS OF EMINENT MEN ON RUSSIA, TURKEY, AND ENGLAND.

"I AM altogether a Russ."—*Lord Chatham*, 1773.

"I thought it would enlighten the world to drive those brutes, the Turks, out of Europe."—*Napoleon I.*

"It would be absurd to think of bolstering up the Turkish power in Europe. It is gone, in fact. We must reconstruct the Greek Empire. There is no doubt it would have been better for the world if the Treaty of Adrianople had not been signed, if the Russians had entered Constantinople, and if the Turkish Empire had been dissolved."—*The Duke of Wellington*, in 1829.

"The protection of the Christians of Turkey by Russia was, no doubt, prescribed by duty, and sanctioned by treaty."—*Lord John Russell's Dispatch to Sir Hamilton Seymour*, 1853.

"The newspaper outcry against Russia is no more respectable to me than the howlings of Bedlam, proceeding as it does from the deepest ignorance, egoism, and paltry national jealousy."—*Carlyle.*

"I believe the people of Russia to be as capable of noble sentiments as any people in Europe."—*Gladstone.*

"It was but bare justice to Russia to say that her dealings with the Ottoman Power had been characterised by as great forbearance as the conduct of that power (Turkey) by continued insolence and incorrigible obstinacy." — *Sir J. Mackintosh.*

"Russia, too, was our ancient ally. . . . In 1770 our allies, the Russians, sent a great fleet into the Mediterranean for the purpose of overpowering the Turks. What was the policy of this country? To assist the Russian navy. In 1798 Russia is called in the treaty our old and natural ally." —*Lord Holland.*

"I heartily wish her (Russia) success. In that war (1828-9), my opinion is that the Turks were the aggressors. . . . . 1833. If we have quietly beheld the temporary occupation of the Turkish capital by the forces of Russia, it is because we have full confidence in the honour and good faith of Russia." —*Lord Palmerston.*

"Was it in the nature of man that the Russians should remain calm spectators of the destruction, he had almost

00037967

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 23 January, 2019